



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **106<sup>th</sup>** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1999

No. 56

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At times of conflict we pray for peace; at times of violence we long for serenity; at times of anger and hatred we hope for charity and respect; and at times of senseless acts, we pray for meaning and purpose. O gracious God, from whom all blessings flow, we plead for Your peace that passes all human understanding and we pray for the comfort of Your presence in our lives. Bless all who grieve, give strength to all who suffer, and keep us all in Your grace, now and evermore. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. INSLEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 800) "An Act to provide for education flexibility partnerships."

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes on each side.

Will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) kindly assume the Chair.

### HONORING YOSEMITE NATIONAL INSTITUTES ON EARTH DAY 1999

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, what a better way to celebrate Earth Day than to honor the great example of a public-private partnership known as the Yosemite National Institutes, an organization that provides award-winning environmental education programs in America's national parks.

YNI now welcomes more than 32,000 participants each year to its three institutes in the magnificent natural settings of Yosemite and Olympic National Parks as well as the Golden Gate National Recreational Area.

Since its founding in 1971, more than 450,000 school children and adults have experienced YNI programs. The partnership between YNI and the National Park Service is commendable. YNI does not receive government funding, but performs a great percentage of the interpretation in each of the parks where it exists.

At YNI, learning occurs in an advocacy-free environment. Ideas and values are not forced upon students; instead, they learn important processes of applying critical thinking to questions and choices that will confront them now and in the future.

YNI is now celebrating 28 years of extraordinary service. I commend all of those who have contributed to this wonderful program and its achievements.

### SHARING RESPONSIBILITY IN KOSOVO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, it is time. Time to arm the Kosovo Liberation Army, not send in ground troops. Let Europe send in the ground troops. It would cost less than one night of bombing to arm the KLA, and that is what we should be doing.

It is also time to indict Milosevic for war crimes, and it is also time to recognize independence for Kosovo, and NATO should support and defend those borders.

I think this is something very important, Madam Speaker. No doubt, America is a superpower, but America is not the only power, and it is time for Europe to step up and take care of problems in their own backyard.

### LEARNING OUR HISTORY LESSON OF THE 1960'S

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, it is strange to me that doves and peaceniks, people who dodged the draft and protested the war, now want to wage war in Yugoslavia, while many defense hawks and former military veterans are raising voices of concern and objection.

As a Vietnam veteran, I cannot help but reflect on the mistakes being made by the Clinton administration with the war in the Balkans. The White House does not even want to call it a war; they prefer the term "conflict." Does that mean our POWs are now going to be called POCs?

There are some people who have yet to learn the lessons of Vietnam. The

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2275

use of limited air strikes can only accomplish limited results. We are witnessing that right now. And having politicians select targets rather than letting military commanders fight the war they know and are trained to do is absolutely wrong.

When President Clinton first initiated the air strikes, we were told we would be in and out in a week or two, and that bully Milosevic would be put in his place. Well, now we are hearing the administration say that we might be in for the long haul, maybe ground troops, an ill-conceived plan obviously from the get-go.

The American people do not know what to believe as this war escalates. We need to learn the history lessons of the 1960's.

#### BANKING PRIVACY ACT

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, Americans are generally concerned about their withering rights of privacy, and my fellow Members will be shocked to learn how at-risk those rights are in regard to our banking records.

Serving on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I recently learned that we Americans do not even have the right to insist that our banks not disclose our personal financial information, our checking account, our savings account records to other companies, and other companies want these records so that they can market and sell us products.

Madam Speaker, I believe that America ought to have the right to simply inform our banks that those records are private records of to whom we write checks, from whom we receive checks. What is in our savings account is a private matter, and we ought to have the right to advise our banks not to share it with anyone.

To that end, Madam Speaker, I will shortly be introducing the Banking Privacy Act, which will give Americans the right to simply keep their records private, keep their private personal lives to themselves, to give Americans what they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

#### CONTINUING OUR FIGHT AGAINST CHILD ABUSE

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, when I look at my young nephews, I see the innocence and joy that only childhood can bring. This is the time of their lives that should be treasured and preserved. It saddens me to know that so many children are robbed of this innocence, or even worse, lose their lives at the hands of abuse.

Even while our overall crime statistics have declined dramatically, child abuse continues to rise. According to the Child Welfare League of America, five children and infants die each day from abuse and neglect. This is five children too many.

Last year I sponsored the Volunteers For Children Act, a bill that was signed into law by President Clinton. Volunteers For Children will help to protect children in after-school activities from being in the care of people with dangerous criminal records.

This is an important step, but it is not enough. We must attack child abuse at every opportunity, by investigating reported abuse thoroughly, by ensuring that children are not returned to abusive environments that they have been taken out of, and penalties for convicted abusers need to become much tougher. Furthermore, we must ensure that children have safe places to go whenever they are in danger.

Madam Speaker, as my colleagues all probably know, April is Child Abuse Prevention Month, and today has been designated Children's Memorial Day, a day to remember children who have been killed and to resolve anew to stop violence against children. I would hope that the spirit of this day and this month will carry on, and that we can increase our efforts to prevent these terrible and violent acts against innocent and defenseless young people.

#### WHAT AMERICANS CAN DO IN THE FIGHT AGAINST HATRED AND VIOLENCE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, children are our future, and as our prayers remain with the families in Littleton, Colorado, in the shadow of the conflict in Kosovo, it is important that we acknowledge that we can do something. Yes, we can offer our prayers. We can commend those young people who were brave and courageous and helped their fellow students. We can give our most heartfelt affection and love to those who have lost their loved ones.

But we can do other things. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), as we just passed out of the Subcommittee on Crime H.R. 1501, which would include intervention on behalf of those children at risk who need mental health services, who are substance abusers, and who, in fact, can be helped.

We need to stop the proliferation of guns. We need to find out why the Internet allows us to have instructions to build bombs, and yes, we must teach our children not to hate. I do not think we can stand by idly and say we do not know what to do, we cannot do anything. We can lift our voices in prayer, but at the same time, we can fight against hatred, we can fight against

the misuse of the Internet and guns, and certainly we can help our children who are disturbed and need mental health services.

#### WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH GOOD ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I rise today on Earth Day to introduce legislation that will clean up a significant environmental problem in southern Utah: the Atlas uranium mill tailings. This legislation will begin the process of removing 10 million tons of low-level radioactive contaminants from the banks of the Colorado River.

These wastes sit just outside of Moab, Utah at the gates of the breathtaking Arches National Park where hundreds of thousands of people visit each year.

The Colorado River provides the sole source of drinking water for tens of millions of people in Arizona, Nevada and California. These radioactive wastes threaten that water supply.

Currently the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has responsibility for cleanup. My legislation will transfer jurisdiction from the NRC to the Department of Energy, where remediation and relocation can begin so as to avoid any further health risks and environmental degradation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Today on Earth Day, let us put aside our ideological differences and commit together to accomplish good environmental policy.

#### PUBLIC PAYS FOR BAD GOVERNMENT POLICY

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Speaker, the Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless in my home State of Georgia provides funds for housing and other services for the homeless in the Atlanta metropolitan area. But an amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) to H.R. 1073 would delay funding to the Task Force and set a bad precedent in the distribution of funds for homeless services in the metropolitan area.

This amendment creates an administrative carve-out that supersedes current policy. In other words, this amendment is aimed at micromanaging HUD. And why would anyone want to do this? Because the Cobb Family Resources, an affordable apartment community in Cobb County, is run by the wife of the representative who introduced the amendment and who was able to get it passed out of the subcommittee.

Madam Speaker, it appears that the amendment is trying to give preferential treatment at the expense of

the needy in our communities. That is what I call bad policy and bald-faced personal service at the public's expense.

□ 1015

But then, what would anyone expect from anyone who supports the Council of Conservative Citizens, a modern day Ku Klux Klan?

#### CONGRESS CAN GIVE OUR TROOPS AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET THE PRIORITY THEY DESERVE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, we are beginning to see evidence of military shortages everywhere. At the same time, our military is dangerously overstretched. We have fewer and fewer resources and more and more missions, many of them of dubious value and wisdom.

Less than a month into a small operation, the President is already calling up 30,000 reservists. The U.S.S. *Enterprise* went to sea short of 400 personnel. Today there are 265,000 American troops in 135 countries. Our troops are not being taken care of properly.

It is tragic that it has taken the war in Kosovo to expose the total mismatch between resources and missions in the U.S. military: world policeman, global social worker, all the while cutting back dramatically and drastically on weapons procurement, training, and personnel.

This administration has not given our troops the priority they deserve. For 7 straight years, the President has sent Congress a defense budget that falls short of its needs. If Congress had not added to this budget each year since 1995, we would be in even worse shape.

Kosovo illustrates the problem, but we in Congress have the power to correct it.

#### LET US COMMIT TO ENDING PAY INEQUITY ON "TAKE YOUR DAUGHTER TO WORK DAY"

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today is "Take Your Daughter to Work Day," and on this day Democrats call for action to make sure that our daughters can earn the same wages as our sons.

As we go into the 21st century, pay inequity is persistent and real. Today women must work for 14 months to earn what their male counterparts earn in a year. We earn 74 cents to every dollar that a man earns. In Illinois, my State, it is actually worse. Women earn only 70 cents.

Pay inequity hurts women and their families. Women lose about \$420,000 in

wages and benefits because of unfair pay practices. It is time to put an end to this very real and costly inequity in the workplace once and for all. Democrats, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ROSA DELAURO), and I am proud to have joined her, have introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 541, to help eliminate the wage gap that still exists between men and women.

When my granddaughter Isabel, who is just 1 year old, enters the work force, I certainly want to be part of the solution guaranteeing that she makes exactly what her male counterparts make.

#### WILL LEADERS ADMIT A FAILING POLICY IN YUGOSLAVIA?

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, Michael Kelly, the editor of the National Journal, said, "It is not too much to ask that the planners (of the war) do not lie, to themselves and to the public, about how their plans are faring. And what is going on with the plan in Yugoslavia is that it is failing, catastrophically."

He added that: "We started a war to protect a people, and we know that, far from being protected, the people are being slaughtered and driven destitute from their homes to starve in the hills."

Columnist Doug Bandow, in yesterday's Washington Times, wrote: "... NATO's blundering assault on Yugoslavia has created every condition it was supposed to prevent."

Even Senator JOHN MCCAIN said yesterday, "The NATO bombing was intended to bring Milosevic to the bargaining table. Most evidence indicates this has had the opposite effect. Apparently, he has greater support than he had before."

We have made things many times worse by our bombings. I doubt, though, that our leaders are big enough to admit that they made a horrible mistake and that we should get out of this war as soon as we possibly can.

#### SCHOOL VIOLENCE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, we are always shocked and stunned by the unexpected, unpredictable, the unimaginable. Perhaps that is why the incident in suburban Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, 2 days ago has left us dazed and numb. But should this incident have been unexpected?

In serene Springfield, Oregon, in friendly, congenial, Paducah, Kentucky, even in the home State of our president, Jonesboro, Arkansas, in fact

over the past 38 months eight other major school shootings that have occurred and taken lives of far too many of our youth.

Very recently, in fact last week in my home county of North Carolina, a teenager 19 years old shot and killed a deputy sheriff. Earlier this month in my district, Vance County, North Carolina, two twins 11 years old shot their family, killed their father, injured their mother and sister.

Madam Speaker, I believe we must search for and find a prescription for peace, both in our lives and in the lives of our children. We should seek to engage our youth. Perhaps each day we should pause, put aside our problems, take stock in our blessings. Each day we should take time to make an extra effort to go out of our way to be kind to someone. We should avoid the differences that divide us, and concentrate on the many common interests that bring us together.

We should get involved. We should work together, confront the problems, and seek to find a prescription for peace within our families and with our youth.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Obey moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, be instructed to disagree with the across the board reduction of funds appropriated with an emergency designation in division B of Public Law 105-277 in the Senate amendment, having the effect of reducing by 44 percent funds made available for counter drug activities, antiterrorism programs including security enhancements at U.S. embassies, Y2K computer upgrades, Plutonium disposition and Uranium purchase, the Coast Guard, Domestic Disaster Assistance, Child Survival, and other emergencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will

be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me say that in the handling of this supplemental appropriation, the Republican majority in this House has given us a case study in how not to proceed. It seems that virtually every time we have an emergency which this Congress is asked to fund, we are being asked by the majority caucus to do one of two things: either to do nothing, or to blow up agreements which had just been reached in the previous year's budget bill by finding offsets to pay for emergency items designated by the administration.

Madam Speaker, I would simply observe that if the provisions of the previous year's budget were so easy to reformat, it would not have taken the majority party 2 months into the new fiscal year before they got their work done last year. The decisions that were arrived at in the budget last year were extremely hard to reach.

When the administration first provided its request to this Congress to respond to the emergency events in Central America with the greatest natural disaster we had in this century, and when they asked us to deal with what is an emerging emergency in farm country, at first the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida, produced a proposal which would have had the bipartisan support of this House. It was an honest, practical, sensible way to proceed. We thought we had a bipartisan agreement.

Then what happened is that contrary signals were sent from the House leadership to the committee leadership. They said no, throw out that approach and identify offsets, so these items will be funded on a nonemergency basis.

What the House did, in my view, was to come up with offsets which could not be more misguided if we had conducted a seminar on how to make mistakes. So we were asked by the majority party to eliminate funding which is necessary for us to have on the table in order to begin discussion with the Russians about how to secure plutonium now in the hands of the Russians so that it does not fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue Nation's, and I think that is a pretty important initiative.

Yet we are being asked to sandbag the ability of the administration to begin those discussions by taking that money out. We are also being asked to take out money which the Congress had previously appropriated for callable capital to the international financial institutions, an act which has caused our Secretary of the Treasury to become extremely concerned about the long-term instability which that could bring in dealing with many of our international economic problems.

In my judgment, those provisions were dumb enough, but then when this proposal went to the Senate, we saw a congressional version of the movie *Dumb and Dumber*. What they proceeded to do was to suggest that we ought to cut 43 percent from a number of other items in the budget last year, items which just a few months ago both parties thought were important enough to include in the budget.

They suggested that we cut, or the Senate amendment suggested we cut \$973 million in funding to correct the Y2K computer problem, which plagues many government agencies, as well as many private businesses.

□ 1030

They suggest that we cut more than \$200 million from various antiterrorism activities, including \$9.3 million in antiterrorism efforts of the FBI and \$43 million from the antiterrorism efforts of the Federal Aviation Administration to prevent bombings and other acts of violence against commercial airlines and their passengers.

It cuts \$288 million from antidrug efforts, including reductions in enforcement activities of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Customs Service. It would have us cut more than \$600 million for the improvement of security at U.S. embassies overseas just 1 month after the administration was chastised in three hearings on this side of the Hill for not putting enough money in that item.

I have seen people fall off both sides of the same horse, but never at the same moment. Yet, that is what this Congress is doing by the actions that the Senate is trying to take on this conference report. It just seems to me that we ought to resist what they are doing.

We have an emergency in Kosovo, and we are hoping that that will be dealt with on a bipartisan basis. We have also had an emergency in our own backyard in the Caribbean with the worst natural disaster that has occurred in this century, and we are trying to do something about that.

We are being told that we are going to take 20,000 refugees from Kosovo to try to relieve that situation, and yet we face the prospect of having many times that number of refugees inundate our own country because of the economic collapse that is attendant to the natural disaster which occurred in Central America.

Yet that funding is not being called an emergency and it is being delayed by actions taken by this House and the actions taken by the other body. It just seems to me that we ought to recognize an emergency when we see it.

We cannot do much today about the fact that the House has already adopted what I consider to be incredibly ill-advised and misguided and certainly, in the case of the Russian plutonium item, a spectacularly destructive act. We cannot prevent the fact that the House has already done that in voting

for the offsets that it has voted on. But we certainly should not compound the problem as the Senate amendment does.

So, very simply, what this motion does is ask the House to go on record asking the conferees to reject that Senate amendment so that we are not in the ludicrous position of blocking efforts to fix the Y2K computer problems, that we are not in a position of cutting off drug funding, funding about which many Members of this body just a couple months ago were posing for holy pictures, trying to show who is most for drug control efforts.

So I would simply say, I do not know any reason why any Member of either party would oppose this motion. We are going to have strong debates in the conference about the ill-advised offsets which this House adopted. But I would think that the House would at least agree that the Senate amendments which were adopted were at least as equally ill-advised and would agree that they ought to be rejected by the conference.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I agree on the need to move this bill quickly. We are dealing with a true emergency in Central America.

Immediately upon recognizing the result of Hurricane Mitch, American armed forces were sent to Central America, and they did a tremendous humanitarian job. They saved lives. They pulled people out of swollen rivers. They helped get people out of the mud. They helped people get water that they could drink, and they improved sanitary conditions. The United States military did an outstanding job in Hurricane Mitch, but there is more to be done.

As one of their good neighbors who spent billions of dollars in the late 1970's and early 1980's to stop communism from taking over that part of the world, which was a successful effort, by the way, I might say, we now have an obligation to help our friends and neighbors when they are in a real time of need.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I do not disagree too much on what we included in the bill for the obligations that needed to be met with the funding that we did include in this bill.

We did have some differences on whether or not the spending should be offset by reducing other accounts in our Federal budget. The decision was made to offset all but the military part of this bill, and we did that.

We had already seen the offsets provided by the other body when we developed our bill. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, we disagreed with the offsets suggested by the other body, and so we developed

our own list of offsets. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I disagree somewhat on some of those.

But, Madam Speaker, the important thing is we need to get this bill moving. We need to get to conference. In conference, we will have great debates, especially about the offsets in this proposal. But we need to get it done, and we can't get it done until we appoint the conferees today.

I have no objection to the motion that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has offered because I agree with him. We do not agree with the offsets that the other body used. There will be, as I said, some vigorous debate on this issue. But, Madam Speaker, I do not object to this motion today, and I would hope that the House could expedite our consideration of it, and move on to its next regular piece of business.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct conferees and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time and for bringing this motion to instruct to the floor.

I am pleased to hear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has no objection to the motion to instruct and would not agree to the Senate offsets. I wish he would not agree to the House offsets as well.

The reason we are here having this discussion, as the Speaker knows, is that, according to the budget rules, when there is an emergency funding bill, an emergency supplemental, we do not have to have offsets.

What is an emergency? Well, many of us think that the greatest natural disaster in this hemisphere in this century, Hurricane Mitch, was thousands and thousands of people losing their lives, millions of people losing their homes and their jobs. The economy is wiped out in Central America. We think that constitutes an emergency. By any measure, it is more of an emergency than most bills we have called emergencies, most of the situations we have called emergencies before.

It was our understanding, going into the bill, that the distinguished leadership of the Committee on Appropriations of the subcommittee and the full committee did not see the necessity for offsets. But instructions from the Re-

publican leadership were to have offsets.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has very eloquently described the consequences of some of the offsets in the House bill relating to plutonium, relating to callable capital, thrusting uncertainty on the international financial institutions.

But this motion to instruct is about not making matters worse by having the House conferees not agree to the Senate offsets, which, as I say, would only make matters worse.

So here we are in a situation where ordinarily we would not need offsets, but this time the Republican leadership has foisted them upon the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations.

We have a bill coming up soon for Kosovo where I hope we will not have offsets. It is hard to explain the inconsistencies in how we deal with these emergencies.

We agree that we must move this along, as the distinguished chairman said. But in order to do that, we have to have some very serious, mature conversations about these offsets.

I just want to convey to the House briefly some of the consequences of this delay that has been caused by this debate on the offset, this departure from the regular order in terms of funding an emergency supplemental bill.

Most of the world seems to have forgotten, because other events have begun to eclipse what has happened in Central America. It is the fate of the Central American countries who suffered the devastation of Hurricane Mitch.

It is now the end of April, 6 months after Hurricane Mitch struck, and none of the sorely needed reconstruction assistance has been approved by Congress. This is an emergency. AID and the Defense Department were able to respond to the immediate needs and restore basic health and sanitation to the devastated areas. However, in doing so, they are using existing resources that have been exhausted.

I associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our distinguished chairman, when he talks and sings in praise of the work of the DOD and the U.S. military in Central America and their assistance there. They are to be praised; the situation would have been much worse without them. We are very proud of their effort.

But it is hard to understand why the money going to the DOD does not need to be offset, but all the other spending on Hurricane Mitch needs to be offset, again, another inconsistency.

To be more precise, several of the major NGOs operating in Honduras, such as CARE, the Catholic Relief Service, and Save the Church are running out of funding, really momentarily. The major Food for Work program under way in Honduras has run out of food to pay its workers.

One hundred thousand small-scale farms will not receive credit or inputs for the first crop of basic grains, corn, bean, and rice as the planting season gets under way.

Planting season is now upon us, and many farmers are without seeds to begin their first major crop since the hurricane. Low yields on the first crop will of course continue the food shortages and increase the emergency food requirements.

Over 2,940 miles of roads and 300 bridges destroyed by the hurricane remain unusable. No significant funding has been provided to begin this rebuilding. Without funds for infrastructure or agricultural recovery, the over 100,000 laborers displaced by the hurricane will remain unemployed or underemployed. This increases pressure on migration to the U.S.

Roughly 200,000 school kids have no schools or are managing in open-air facilities. Over 1,700 schools were destroyed by the hurricane, and little funding to rebuild them has been made available.

Over 700 health clinics, providing the most basic of health services to the impoverished area, were destroyed. The chances for the recurrence or the spread of epidemics for malaria, cholera and dengue fever increases as the recovery of health systems delayed.

Congress needs to act now to make this funding available. It is in fact long overdue. We want an economic recovery in Central America. We do need to provide some assistance to spur that along. We should be doing it without offsets. Certainly we should do it without the Senate offsets.

It is in that regard that I once again commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership in bringing this very enlightened motion to instruct to the floor, and I am delighted that the distinguished gentleman (Mr. YOUNG) has no objection to it.

Let us move forward, keep our promises to our Latin American neighbors and relieve their plight as we move forward. We must move now.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me the time, and I rise in support, very strong support of this motion to instruct. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is not objecting to this motion, and I congratulate the chairman on his leadership.

I want to associate myself with the remarks both that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made earlier and that the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has just made.

With respect to offsets and with respect to the necessity to move the supplemental as quickly as possible both

for our farmers and for those victims of Mitch, we have, as the gentlewoman indicated, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) may have referenced as well, some 800,000-plus people.

We see the pictures of refugees in Albania and in Macedonia being created by the violence and, from my perspective, war crimes being committed by the Milosevic army. But having said that, we also know that there are other reasons to support this motion to instruct.

□ 1045

I want to specifically refer to the Y2K emergency fund that was put in, the supplemental that we proposed last year, or the omnibus bill we appropriated last year, some \$2.25 billion for nondefense agencies to make sure their critical computer systems are Year 2000 compliant. The motion that the Senate adopted would cut that by 44 percent. Quite obviously, that would have a devastating effect on all the other programs, but as well on the Y2K, which all of us, all of us, admit is an emergency.

There is not a day that goes by that we do not hear on our televisions or our radio or read in our newspapers about the issue of Y2K. Are we, on December 31 of 1999, going to have our computer systems, which are involved in almost everything we rely on on a daily basis, going to recognize the change and be able to ensure that the systems remain operative as they should? Obviously most critical, I suppose, with the FAA airplanes flying, but to so many other systems, large and small.

On the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, we tried in a bipartisan manner to enact the critical appropriation as an emergency fiscal year 1998 supplemental. But we were continually told by the leadership to wait until the end of the year. Unfortunately, now the Senate has waited until well into the fiscal year and are proposing a 44 percent cut.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful that not only will this motion to instruct prevail, which I presume it is going to, but also that the Senate, in conference, will see the wisdom of this motion to instruct and will not only reconsider this amendment to cut by 44 percent those supplemental funds but will, in addition, also see the necessity, the emergency of reconsidering their requirement for offsets. And that on those matters that are truly emergency, which we believe the supplemental is, we will move ahead without political rancor, without debate about offsets, to see that our farmers, those ravaged by an act of God such as Mitch, and those as well ravaged by war and by genocide will all be given the help of this Nation and of our people as quickly as possible.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me simply say in closing, Madam Speaker, that I think this Congress needs to recognize that we are facing a genuine emergency in the consideration of this bill. A bunch of people wearing suits on the floor of the House of Representatives, or sport coats, might not think that there is an emergency in farm country, but real live dirt farmers see the fact that world farm prices are at near record low levels; they see that commercial lenders are refusing to extend the credit that is necessary in many instances for farmers to proceed with planting; and they understand why the President thought that this was an emergency and so designated it.

I would simply note that it is now the latter part of April and we are just now talking about going to conference on this legislation. It is getting dangerously late for those American farmers. And I would say the situation in Central America is also pressing.

Now, many people will ask why should we provide emergency funding because of the Hurricane Mitch problems in Central America. I would simply make the following observation.

We spent almost \$9 billion in countering what we thought was a military threat in Central America through the funding of the Contras, through the funding of military aid and economic aid to El Salvador and a number of other Central American countries when they were having military problems. But we now run the danger of ignoring what is happening in that region at a time when something is going on which is just as destabilizing and in fact could be more so than the military confrontations that were taking place just a few short years ago.

Polls have shown that almost 10 percent of the population of Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador are thinking about leaving their countries and moving north because of the devastation caused by that hurricane. If that happens, we could see over a million people trying to work their way up, either legally or illegally, into this country. If people have a choice of simply standing in the rain or walking in the rain, they are going to start walking north. That could cost this country as much as \$7,000 a child for every child who comes into this country.

And so it seems to me even if we do not want to focus on the humanitarian obligations we have to our neighbors, it seems to me at least we have a self-interest reason for moving this legislation on and recognizing it for the emergency that it really is.

I would urge adoption of the amendment and a recognition that, in general, the offsets which are being proposed both by this body and the other body are ill-advised, counterproductive, and in some cases downright dangerous.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAP-

TUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and want to thank him for his leadership on bringing this motion to the House.

I felt compelled to speak on this because of the condition of rural America and the fact that again we are encountering delay in the consideration of this legislation; more amendments being offered in the other body, slowing down a very important supplemental package that contains many items relating to assistance for Central America and Hurricane Mitch, but equally important for the farmers here in this country.

There is a literal depression that is affecting our country from coast to coast among people who are hard-working, taxpaying Americans, and this Congress is incapable of clearing a bill quickly to help the American people who so desperately need it.

I find it completely ironic that now we here in the House have to instruct the conferees to go back to the other body and say, no, we do not want this amendment either because they are dipping into cuts in other accounts that deal with Y2K and other programs, but tucked under all of that is this giant need in rural America where farmers are being put at the end of the line waiting as Congress dithers more, is unable to reach any kind of conclusion, and we have to have more delays.

So, to me, I will support the motion to instruct simply as an act of protest against the inability of this institution to protect the American people's interests. Frankly, I am very much interested in us being internationally involved and doing what is responsible elsewhere, but the point is that rural America is in depression and we are acting like nothing is happening.

I just wish every tractor would come back to Washington and surround this place and make the leadership of this institution and the other body responsible for what is happening. Farm income is going to drop another 20 percent this year. USDA has used up all of its emergency loan authority. Credit is not being extended this spring. Seed companies back home are holding debt from last year.

Now is planting season, my colleagues. Spring has been in existence for over a month now and we cannot bring a bill out of this Congress. Where is the leadership of this institution and the other body in trying to meet the real needs of the American people, which are urgent? For the life of me I do not understand. To me, it is a disgrace that we have to debate these kinds of amendments that are being loaded on over in the Senate and not clear that portion of the bill which is so desperately needed by our own people.

I want to thank the ranking member on our full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), whose State is as heavily affected as my own, as well as every other Member here who understands the pain of the rural countryside today, what has happened to prices, as we sit here on our haunches and are unable to clear a bill. I ask again, where is the leadership in this body and in the other one to recognize the pain of the rural countryside?

Please support the motion to instruct and, more importantly, disgorge the farm portion of this bill and get it moving.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, having been led to believe there was not to be any debate on this motion, I yielded back my time. But at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I did believe that we were not to have any debate here so that we could expedite this motion and get on with the rest of the business of the House. But I would like to respond again, as I said earlier, we did not agree with the Senate offsets in the bill. That is why I am willing to support this motion that does not agree with the Senate offsets. There has been sufficient leadership in the House on this measure to move this to conference, and we will move it to conference quickly.

The gentleman is right, there has been a little bit of a delay on the part of the other body. I met with the majority leader of the Senate yesterday and discussed that issue and we are prepared to move expeditiously.

There will be differences, even among those of us who are conferees, on the House offsets. But what I have to tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we made a determination that we were going to, except for true national defense emergencies, offset the spending bills.

Now, when we dealt with disasters in our own country just a few years back, we offset the money that we spent for those disasters. In fact, one of the sources for those offsets was one of the offsets that the other side objects to now.

So we will work this out, but I would hope that we would keep this from becoming a partisan political issue. I am attempting to move the appropriations bills in such a way that they relate to the needs of the country and to move them as expeditiously as possible under the House rules.

So we are prepared to do this, and we are prepared to accept this motion today. I would suggest that I am ready to vote if the gentleman from Wisconsin is ready to vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I am informed now that I have one additional request for time, and then that will be the last person I yield to on this side on this issue.

I just think the record is clear and we need to be reminded of it. This side has not made this supplemental a partisan issue. This side made clear to the gentleman that we were willing to support, on a bipartisan basis, his initial recommendations that he intended to make to the committee and to the House on how we ought to proceed on this supplemental, because the gentleman did correctly recognize that this was an emergency which should be funded on an emergency basis.

It was then the gentleman's caucus or his leadership, I am not sure which, who then instructed the majority side of the Committee on Appropriations to take a different route and, instead of seeking common ground with the President and us on this issue, they produced a proposal which they knew we would not buy.

I am sorry, but I believe it is downright stupid and dangerous for us to take off the table the money which we need in order to negotiate a settlement with the Russians that will remove the possibility that weapons-grade plutonium, which is now in their hands, will be diverted to other far more dangerous hands.

□ 1100

It is stupid and ridiculous for this House to take that position, and yet that is one of the offsets that this House decided to impose on the President. At the very time that we are talking about trying to get the Russians to help in solving the Yugoslav mess, they are yanking off the table the principal carrot that we have to reach agreement on the disposal of the most dangerous material in the universe.

Now, there is nothing partisan about that, but there is something very stupid about it. And that is why we are opposed to what the House did. We regret the fact that a proposal, which started out to be bipartisan because of the wise and correct judgments of the gentleman, have now been turned into something else by the determination of the Republican leadership of this House to have yet another unnecessary fight with the President.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me just say in the 1 minute that I have, this is in the national interest of the United States. Forget about being humanitarian and helping Central Americans, which we want to do.

Do we want to see a million people who have no home and no place to work and have nothing to lose? They will come north; that is their mission

if they have no opportunity, no hope. Do we want to see disease spread? It will spread north. Do we want to see the drug cartels take over regions that otherwise have no other hope? They will do that.

It is in the national interest of the United States to provide this funding, to have done so already. The rainy season starts. A million people who have nothing to lose. It is in the national interest of the United States to do this.

But our Republican friends have proposed those provisions that are impossible to accept as offsets to the supplemental. Imagine in the Senate having domestic drug programs cut at a time that the drug cartels are even moving more forcefully forward.

So I support the amendment of the gentleman, but our cause and our case is that this is an emergency. We have got a million people right to the south of us and they need help now and we are languishing with this. We need to move it and move it now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to suggest that if the worst thing the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) calls me during the balance of the appropriations process this year is stupid, I will be happy because there are other things that will be mentioned.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I did not call him stupid, and I do not believe him to be stupid. I called the action taken by this House stupid, and I stand by that statement.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I must respond that offsetting spending when we are trying to balance the Federal budget is not stupid. When we have a national debt that has debt service that is equal to or exceeds what we invest in our only national security, it is not stupid to try to do something about that debt and to try to balance the budget.

And if we are going to spend on one hand without taking the budget into a deficit situation, we have got to take it away somewhere else. And we cannot go visiting around the world dropping off commitments for money for one thing or another without even consulting with the Congress and expect the Congress to just pay the bill when it gets here.

Now, that is not partisan either. What it is is trying to be responsible and keep the commitment that all of us have made.

I do not know of anyone, there may be one or two, that have said we should not balance the budget. But everyone that I know in this House has committed themselves to a balanced budget. And you cannot balance the budget by continuing to spend. So we take some of the items that are not quite as



important as responding to the disaster and we offset them.

Now let me mention what the offset was that the gentleman is so upset about. We used as an offset callable capital to the World Bank, callable capital which has not been called in over 20 years and that is not even important, but callable capital which was the same source that was used in this House to offset a disaster appropriations bill. For a disaster in the United States in the western part of our country, we used callable capital as the offset.

I know the gentlewoman is shaking her head, but the fact is, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has it on record and indicates who voted for that amendment by our friend and previous colleague from California (Mr. Fazio) to reduce the callable capital for the World Bank by the amount needed to offset that bill.

Now, if that consistency was mentioned before, if we are going to be consistent, if callable capital as an offset was okay now, why is it not okay now?

So I think, Madam Speaker, that we have what I think Harry Truman called a red herring, but we are going to debate these issues in conference and we will come to a resolution and this bill will be provided.

We are not withholding the immediate emergency support that was needed in Central America. We did that already. We sent troops and they took care of the immediate emergency requirements.

So, anyway, despite all of this debate and despite this argument, I still support the motion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I say we get on about our business and get into conference and settle this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Archer	Baldacci
Ackerman	Armey	Baldwin
Aderholt	Bachus	Ballenger
Allen	Baird	Barcia
Andrews	Baker	Barr

Barrett (NE)	Eshoo	Lantos
Barrett (WI)	Etheridge	Largent
Bartlett	Evans	Larson
Barton	Everett	Latham
Bass	Ewing	LaTourette
Bateman	Farr	Lazio
Becerra	Fattah	Leach
Bentsen	Filner	Lee
Bereuter	Fletcher	Levin
Berkley	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Berman	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Berry	Fossella	Lipinski
Biggert	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Lowey
Bishop	Frostinghuysen	Lucas (KY)
Blagojevich	Frost	Lucas (OK)
Bliley	Galleghy	Luther
Blumenauer	Ganske	Maloney (CT)
Blunt	Gejdenson	Maloney (NY)
Boehlert	Gekas	Manzullo
Boehner	Gephardt	Markey
Bonior	Gibbons	Martinez
Bono	Gilchrest	Mascara
Borski	Gillmor	Matsui
Boswell	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Boucher	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Boyd	Goode	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	McCrery
Brady (TX)	Goodling	McDermott
Brown (OH)	Gordon	McGovern
Bryant	Goss	McHugh
Burr	Graham	McInnis
Burton	Granger	McIntosh
Buyer	Green (TX)	McIntyre
Callahan	Green (WI)	McKinney
Calvert	Greenwood	McNulty
Camp	Gutierrez	Meehan
Campbell	Gutknecht	Meek (FL)
Canady	Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)
Cannon	Hall (TX)	Menendez
Capps	Hansen	Metcalfe
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cardin	Hayes	Millender-
Carson	Hayworth	McDonald
Castle	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Herger	Miller, Gary
Chambliss	Hill (IN)	Miller, George
Chenoweth	Hill (MT)	Minge
Clay	Hilleary	Mink
Clayton	Hilliard	Moakley
Clement	Hinchee	Mollohan
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Coble	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Coburn	Hoeffel	Morella
Collins	Hoekstra	Murtha
Combest	Holden	Myrick
Condit	Holt	Nadler
Conyers	Hooley	Napolitano
Cook	Horn	Neal
Cooksey	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Costello	Houghton	Ney
Cox	Hoyer	Northup
Coyne	Hulshof	Norwood
Cramer	Hunter	Oberstar
Crane	Hutchinson	Obey
Crowley	Hyde	Olver
Cubin	Inslee	Ortiz
Cummings	Isakson	Ose
Cunningham	Istook	Owens
Danner	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Packard
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Pallone
Davis (VA)	Jefferson	Pascarell
Deal	Jenkins	Pastor
DeFazio	John	Paul
DeGette	Johnson (CT)	Payne
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Pease
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
DeMint	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Phelps
Dickey	Kelly	Pickering
Dicks	Kennedy	Pickett
Dingell	Kildee	Pitts
Dixon	Kilpatrick	Pomboy
Doggett	Kind (WI)	Porter
Dooley	King (NY)	Portman
Doollittle	Kingston	Price (NC)
Doyle	Klecza	Pryce (OH)
Dreier	Klink	Quinn
Duncan	Knollenberg	Ramstad
Dunn	Kolbe	Rangel
Edwards	Kucinich	Regula
Ehlers	Kuykendall	Reyes
Ehrlich	LaFalce	Reynolds
Emerson	LaHood	Riley
English	Lampson	

Rivers	Shuster	Tiahrt
Rodriguez	Simpson	Tierney
Roemer	Sisisky	Toomey
Rogan	Skeen	Traficant
Rogers	Skelton	Turner
Rohrabacher	Slaughter	Udall (CO)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (MI)	Udall (NM)
Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Vento
Royce	Snyder	Visclosky
Rush	Souder	Walden
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Walsh
Ryun (KS)	Spratt	Wamp
Sabo	Stabenow	Waters
Salmon	Stark	Watkins
Sanchez	Stearns	Watt (NC)
Sanders	Stenholm	Watts (OK)
Sandlin	Strickland	Waxman
Sanford	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Sawyer	Stupak	Weldon (PA)
Scarborough	Sununu	Weller
Schaffer	Sweeney	Wexler
Schakowsky	Talent	Weygand
Scott	Tauscher	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wicker
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Wilson
Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Wise
Shadegg	Terry	Wolf
Shaw	Thomas	Woolsey
Shays	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wynn
Sherwood	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Shimkus	Thune	Young (FL)
Shows	Thurman	

#### NOT VOTING—19

Bonilla	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Brown (CA)	Linder	Tancred
Brown (FL)	McKeon	Tanner
Engel	Moore	Towns
Ford	Nussle	Weiner
Hastings (FL)	Radanovich	
Kasich	Rahall	

□ 1126

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 22, 1999, I was unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 96. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 96.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, SKEEN, WOLF, KOLBE, PACKARD, CALLAHAN, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, OBEY, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, HOYER, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PAS-TOR.

There was no objection.

□ 1130

#### BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CLEANUP AND HEALTH ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 145, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 145

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the



Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Shuster or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. After disposition of that amendment, the provisions of the bill as then perfected shall be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 145 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 999, the Beaches Environmental Assessment, Cleanup, and Health Act of 1999.

The purpose of this legislation is to improve the quality of coastal recreational waters by establishing national uniform criteria for testing and monitoring coastal recreational waters.

In addition, H.R. 999 establishes uniform notification to the public on the quality of those waters in order to protect both the environment and public health.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open for amendment by section.

Additionally, the rule provides for the consideration of the amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report, if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) or his designee.

The rule further provides that the manager's amendment shall be considered as read, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall not be subject to amendment or to a division of question, and is debatable for 10 minutes equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

If adopted, the amendment is considered as part of the base text for further amendment purposes.

The Chair is authorized by the rule to grant priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

The rule allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, I believe House Resolution 145 is a fair rule. It is an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 999, the Beaches Environmental Assessment, Cleanup and Health Act of 1999.

As I understand it, some Members may wish to offer germane amendments to this bill, and under this open rule they will have every opportunity to do so.

H.R. 999 establishes uniform criteria for testing coastal recreation waters and for public notification of water quality. Indeed, as this Nation's first and most ardent conservationist, President Theodore Roosevelt noted upon the establishment of the Waterways Commission our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated and should be treated as

part of one coherent plan and not in haphazard or piecemeal fashion.

By establishing public notification, this bill will not only protect public health, but will encourage tourism and business development along our coastal areas.

Each year, an estimated 180 million people from around the world visit America's coastal waters for recreational purposes, supporting over 28 million jobs and leading to investments of over \$50 billion each year in goods and services.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 999 is not a regulatory bill. It gives the EPA no new regulatory authorities. The bill instead offers an incentive to State and local governments to test beaches for pathogens which are dangerous to human health.

By establishing a grant program, H.R. 999 gives the States the ability to monitor the safety of coastal recreational waters and to set a deadline for updating State water quality standards for these waters to protect the public from disease-carrying organisms.

In my own district, which includes a portion of Lake Ontario, this bill will encourage tourism by furthering public confidence in the water quality. By ensuring that water quality, the very integrity of our waterways, this bill will meet President Roosevelt's challenge that this Nation should strive to leave to the next generation the national honor unstained and the national resources unexhausted.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their hard work on H.R. 999, and I urge my colleagues to support both this open rule and the underlying bill.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, House Resolution 145 is fair, a completely open rule, and I urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), my colleague and my friend, for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join nearly all of my colleagues in support of this beaches bill.

We in Massachusetts are very fortunate to have some of the most beautiful beaches in the country. Once the warm weather hits, residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and tourists from around the world head to Cape Cod, the south shore or the north shore.

This bill will help them enjoy themselves even more in keeping our beaches clean and making sure the clean beaches do not stop at the next State.

Madam Speaker, it will also help create and monitor public health standards to make sure that our beaches and coastal areas are clean and safe.

Each year over 180 million people visit our American beaches. Those visits create over 28 million jobs, they generate millions of dollars in revenue, and we need to make sure that our people can swim in our oceans and feel confident that the water quality is what it should be.

At the moment, there are no Federal standards for testing or monitoring our beaches. That means that one State could allow a higher level of dangerous pathogens than its neighbor, and some of these pathogens have names I cannot even pronounce, and I certainly do not want to swim in them.

This bill will set the State standards more in line with one another and if, heaven forbid, a public health risk should arise, this bill will help inform people when the beaches are unsafe for swimming.

It will also authorize \$150 million over 5 years to help States put the monitoring programs in place and keep our clean water rules uniform from sea to shining sea.

Madam Speaker, it is a good rule. It is a good bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill. I would like to congratulate first the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), my friend who has worked long and hard on this; his fellow surfer, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), who I know is going to be here to back him up; and the very important chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), who has worked long and hard on this issue, too. It is very important that we move ahead in a bipartisan way.

I would also like to congratulate the brilliant statement from my good friend from south Boston who has not quite as many beaches as California or Florida, but they are beautiful beaches in Massachusetts, I will agree.

Today is Earth Day and it is a very important time to mark what is obviously an important environmental accomplishment for us here. We all know how enjoyable it is for people to spend time with their families at the beaches, and as we head into the summer months obviously we are going to see an increase in that.

Every year, in fact, over 180 million Americans spend time on our coastal waters and that is the case, as I have said, in both California and in many other States. However, it is important to note that clean coastal waters are not just about fun. They really are about business, because there are 30

million jobs and roughly \$50 billion in investments that take place and are supported by recreation along our Nation's shores.

This bill itself is a very strong, prohealth, proenvironment measure. It shows that environmental issues are best handled using common sense and consensus building; and the bill's sponsors and, of course, as I said, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, deserve a great deal of credit for moving us in the direction of a common-sense approach to a very, very important environmental issue.

□ 1145

So I would simply like to congratulate my friend from New York who is doing a superb job of managing this rule, and the authors of this legislation, as I said, and the Surfers Caucus, which is a very important, very, very important group in this body, and again the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work. I look forward to seeing strong bipartisan support for this measure.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky). Pursuant to House Resolution 145 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 999.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) to assume the Chair temporarily.

□ 1146

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we indeed are considering the Beaches Environmental Assessment

bill, and it is a bipartisan bill that was reported by our committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, by unanimous vote. Indeed, this is legislation that is most appropriate on this Earth Day.

The distinguished members of the Committee on Rules have quite clearly explained both the rule and the bill. I would like to focus on a couple of specific points.

The first is to note and emphasize, this is not a regulatory bill. It gives EPA no new regulatory authorities. After analyzing the bill, the Congressional Budget Office concluded that it contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the unfunded mandates act, and it would impose no costs to State, local or tribal governments.

I also wish to allay some concerns expressed by some of the States. The grant program established by this bill does not provide EPA with an opportunity to micromanage State monitoring programs if a State chooses to seek Federal assistance. I also wish to be sure that the Members understand, particularly those Members from farm States, that we worked out a previous concern that was expressed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, and indeed we have an en bloc amendment which we will be offering shortly, and we have a letter from the American Farm Bureau which states:

"The en bloc amendment to the beaches bill addresses our concerns about this legislation.

"The proposal to define coastal recreation waters to not include any inland waters addresses our concerns about nonpoint source impacts. The proposal that a State can use its criteria for human health if they are as protective as Federal criteria addresses our concerns about unfunded mandates. Thank you for your attention to this matter."

So we removed any concern that the Farm Bureau might have. So we indeed do bring a bill to the floor today which has overwhelming bipartisan support. I urge its adoption.

Today the House is considering H.R. 999, the Beaches Environmental Assessment, Cleanup and Health Act of 1999.

This is a bipartisan bill that was reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by unanimous voice vote.

H.R. 999 amends the Clean Water Act to establish a grant program for States to monitor the safety of coastal recreation waters, and to set a deadline for updating State water quality standards for these waters to protect the public from disease-carrying organisms.

Each year over 180 million people visit coastal waters for recreational purposes. This activity supports over 28 million jobs and leads to investments of over \$50 billion each year in goods and services.

Public confidence in the quality of our Nation's waters is important not only to each citizen who swims or surfs, but also to the tourism and recreation industries that rely on safe and swimmable coastal waters.

It is important to note that H.R. 999 is not a regulatory bill. It gives EPA no new regulatory authorities. After analyzing the bill, the

Congressional Budget Office concluded that "H.R. 999 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments."

The legislation that we are bringing up today has been carefully crafted to balance the concerns of States, EPA, the environmental community and other interested parties.

This is a bipartisan bill that uses incentives, not mandates, to improve public health and safety by monitoring the quality of our Nation's coastal waters.

I urge you to join me in supporting this legislation.

I wish to allay one outstanding concern expressed by some States. The grant program established by this bill does not provide EPA with an opportunity to micro-manage State monitoring programs if a State chooses to seek Federal assistance.

Under this legislation, EPA is to establish a level of protection for monitoring programs, which will be used to determine if a program is eligible for a grant. But each individual State program determines how that level of protection is reached.

By providing grants this legislation provides incentives to all States to develop monitoring programs that protect public health and safety. This does not mean uniform monitoring programs. This does not mean that EPA may impose a Federal template on States.

I also wish to allay some concerns I have heard that the Farm Bureau may have. As I stated earlier, this is not a regulatory bill. It does not address control of pollution from point or nonpoint sources. It imposes no new mandates, unfunded or otherwise.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of our subcommittee, be authorized to manage the balance of the time on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I first want to commend and congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), my friend, the distinguished subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, on his leadership. He has dealt with us in a fair and bipartisan manner, which is the way he always treats us and we appreciate it very, very much.

This simple but important legislation aims at protecting our Nation's beachgoers from unhealthy ocean water quality conditions. Whether it is swimming along the Great Lakes, surfing off of southern California, or vacationing at the Jersey shore, beachgoers everywhere have the right to know that the beaches they choose to visit are safe for themselves and their families.

Madam Chairman, this legislation is the product of work conducted over the past few Congresses. Originally introduced by our friend and former colleague, Bill Hughes, in 1990, this issue has subsequently been picked up by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), and by the chief sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). I want to commend these gentlemen for their dedication and tireless efforts to protect the public from unhealthy water conditions at our Nation's beaches, and I hope that this time we can have it signed into law.

The BEACH bill advocates three simple principles:

First, beach water quality should be monitored. We cannot know whether waters are safe unless the waters are adequately tested.

Second, water quality criteria should be uniform. Just as we provide assurances to the public that water supplies will be safe for drinking no matter which State a person happens to be in, the public should feel confident that the public health standards at our Nation's beaches meet minimum consistent health requirements.

Finally, if a health problem is discovered at a beach, the public has the right to prompt, accurate and effective notification so that they may protect themselves and their families.

To accomplish these principles, this legislation authorizes over \$30 million in funding for Federal, State and local partnerships for water quality monitoring and notification. Under this legislation, States and localities will be given the flexibility to tailor their monitoring and notification programs to meet local needs, so long as these programs comply with EPA's minimum requirements for the protection of public health and safety.

In addition, the BEACH Bill directs the EPA to periodically review and develop revised water quality criteria for coastal areas to ensure we are using the best scientific information available. The public deserves no less.

Finally, this legislation requires EPA to maintain a publicly available database of our Nation's beaches, listing those beaches that comply with water quality standards and those that do not. This information will be very helpful to many Americans for summer vacation planning, so that they will know whether the waters at their favorite vacation spot are safe and will choose accordingly.

Every year, over 180 million individuals vacation along our Nation's coastal waters. As another summer season rapidly approaches, let us make sure that we take the appropriate steps to protect our Nation's beachgoers from unnecessary threats to their health and safety.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chairman, the American Oceans Campaign, in a communication sent to every member of this body, pointed out the following:

"The current approach to beach water testing is a mixture of inconsistent criteria and practices. Passing the BEACH bill will wipe out the inconsistencies and improve public health protections nationwide."

As one of America's favorite actors, Ted Danson, who is president of the American Oceans Campaign has said, "A day at the beach should not end with a visit to the doctor's office."

I have to give great credit where great credit is due, to the gentleman from southern California (Mr. BILBRAY). This bill will set minimum standards for beach water quality, and it will require EPA to establish performance criteria, and it will require the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a national beach water pollution database that will let the public know where monitoring programs are in place and where beach waters are impaired.

Madam Chairman, the en bloc amendment improves upon the bill, H.R. 999, that we reported out of committee by unanimous voice vote.

This package includes noncontroversial technical, and clarifying items and has been worked out with the ranking minority Member.

In summary, the en bloc:

Clarifies that State criteria for pathogens or pathogen indicators for coastal recreation waters must be as protective of human health as EPA's criteria.

This does not mean that States must adopt criteria that are identical to those that have been published by EPA. States adopt water quality criteria under section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act and continue to have the flexibility, provided under that section to change EPA's criteria based on site-specific conditions, or to adopt different, scientifically-justified criteria.

Thus, if a State can demonstrate that the pathogen indicators that it is using are as protective of human health as the criteria for pathogen indicators that EPA has published, a State may continue to use its existing criteria.

As a result, if no appropriations are provided to EPA for this purpose, EPA does not need to take funds away from other clean water act Programs to provide grants for monitoring and notification programs.

Clarifies that the information provided to the public in the information database authorized under section 406(c) is intended to be information on exceedances of water quality standards in coastal recreation waters only. This database does not address other matters.

Clarifies that EPA implementation of a monitoring and notification program will occur only in situations where a state is not implementing a program that protects public health and safety.

The bill does not provide for partial EPA implementation and partial state implementation of a monitoring and notification program.

In addition, EPA's duty to conduct a monitoring and notification program is subject to the same conditions as a state program implemented under section 406(b)(2). This means that EPA has the same flexibility that states

are provided under that section to target available resources to those waters that it determines are the highest priorities. EPA's duty to implement a monitoring and notification program is no more expansive than a State's duty.

Clarifies that the term "coastal recreation waters" includes only the Great Lakes and waters that are adjacent to the coastline of the United States. "Coastal recreation waters" is not synonymous with the "coastal zone" as defined under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The geographic scope of this act does not include any inland waters and does not extend beyond the mouth of any river or stream or other body of water having unimpaired natural connection with open sea.

Clarifies that Indian tribes with coastal recreation waters are eligible for grants for monitoring programs.

Clarifies that Federal agencies are to implement monitoring programs for federally-owned beaches, such as national seashores.

Finally, the amendment changes the short title of the bill to refer to "awareness" rather than "assessment."

Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the person most responsible in this whole United States of America, out of 250 million people, for bringing us to this point today, the author of the bill.

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), our full committee chairman, along with our ranking members, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), for all the help. Their bipartisan effort has really shown that we cannot only protect the environment, but we can do it together.

This bill is a good example of not only talking about working together here in Congress to help the public and to protect the public's health, but actually having States and counties and health officials and the EPA and the Federal Government all working together for this goal.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYENDALL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and many others for their encouragement and their help in bringing this together.

I want to really thank the people that helped bring this bill to reality because so often our good intentions here

in Congress do not reflect the reality out in mainstream America, and out in the waters of our Nation. I want to thank the San Diego County Environmental Health Department and the Surfrider Foundation, specifically, Chris Gonaver of the County of San Diego, and Gary Sirota and Darryl Hatheway of the Surfrider Foundation for their instrumental work on the development of this public health measure.

Additionally, I want to join the chairman in thanking the San Diego County Medical Association for its support, the Center for Marine Conservation, and specifically, the American Oceans Campaign, led by Ted Danson, whose son is also a surfer. I want to thank them for their critical help on this item.

Madam Speaker, roughly 60 percent of Americans live within 30 miles of a coastline. I happen to have had the privilege of growing up a block from the beach and I live nine blocks from the beach now, and sometimes we wonder, we might as well live in Kansas when we are that far away from the ocean!

But this bill, the Beach Environment Awareness Cleanup and Health Act of 1999, is a bill that I think all of us that use the beaches of America will recognize has been a long time in coming. We all know about and we can talk about the problems that affect people with certain health aspects for long-term exposure. We worry about what happens to our children if they live 20 years next to a hazardous waste dump. We are worried about our senior citizens if they drink certain water for over 40 years.

This bill is addressing something that we have overlooked, and that is the fact that our children and our families can enter coastal waters on one day, for one moment, and contract diseases such as hepatitis, encephalitis, and different related illnesses related to pathogens. I have had surfers in my district actually get inner brain infections and almost die from one exposure. These are things that we need to address.

I want to point out that H.R. 999 is really aimed not at finding fault, but at finding answers. It is a way to include, first of all, our public health directors in the formation of criteria for this country, not from Washington on down, but from America's communities on up, and have the Federal Government work as a partner in the formation of the criteria to protect our families' health.

□ 1200

Also, H.R. 999 understands and recognizes the unique differences in these regions. When I come back to this coast and see these coastal waters and surf with my children, it is totally different than what we see in the West Coast.

H.R. 999 has the type of flexibility that we have only talked about for so long, that allows the local commu-

nities to address their local environmental concerns and do that with the aid of the Federal Government, rather than what we have seen so often, sadly, where we have seen local conflict with the Federal strategies.

The bill requires the development of updated criteria, in cooperation with public health agencies. It does not require the local States to take action if they choose not to. It does require the EPA to address the public health problems with this issue in every region, but in cooperation if the local communities want it.

H.R. 999 creates a uniform level of protection, so that when any parent goes to any beach that is being used anywhere in the United States, that parent can feel with some level of confidence that the water that their children is entering is safe to have contact with. That situation does not exist now.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask support for H.R. 999, not just for those of us who use the water, and not just for those of us who like to look at the water. I would ask that H.R. 999 also be passed because it is the beginning of a new way to fulfill our responsibilities, not just to the environment but to our citizens and to ourselves.

The cooperative effort of H.R. 999, Democrats and Republicans, local and Federal and State people all working together, really shows that to care for the environment, we must care about the community and every community, not just Washington, D.C. H.R. 999 sets an example to protect the public health, and do it in a fair and reasonable and effective way.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, do not find excuses to oppose this bill. Look into the future and see what this bill can do for our public health and for our processes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 999, the BEACH bill. I have some supporting material here, which I would ask to be included in the record along with my statement.

I want to first thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee, Mr. SHUSTER, and the chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, Mr. BOEHLERT, for all their hard work, and that of their staffs, on this bill, and for making this important public health issue a priority. The ranking members on the committee, Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. BORSKI, have worked with them hand in hand to help advance and strengthen this bill, and their bipartisan collaboration has been key to the bill's progress. I also want to acknowledge and thank all my colleagues that have rolled up their sleeves and worked with me on the BEACH bill, both this year and in years past.

I am also very grateful for the input and assistance that I received during the drafting of this bill, and in the subsequent discussions on its progress, from the county of San Diego's Department of Environmental Health Services, which administers one of the best ocean testing programs in the world, and from the Surfrider Foundation, which has also been instrumental in helping to improve public education on water quality issues. Input from local

health agencies and from organizations like Surfrider have been key in identifying existing problems and shortcomings which make this bill so essential. In particular, Mr. Chairman, Chris Gonaver at the County's Environmental Health Department and Gary Sirota of the Surfrider Foundation have provided critical advice and input to me and my office on this bill since its inception, and deserve a great deal of credit for its development.

I would also like to thank the San Diego County Medical Society for taking an advocacy role on this issue by endorsing H.R. 999, and the American Oceans Campaign and the Center for Marine Conservation for their continuing support and efforts in helping to move this bill along. This is an exceptional range of support—public health officials, medical professionals, and the environmental community—and it further underscores both the merits of and need for H.R. 999.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of significant importance not only to myself and my San Diego district, but to all Americans who live near or love visiting our coastal areas. As someone who has grown up and lived in and near the ocean all his life, surfing, swimming, and sailing in it, it is quite simply an integral part of my life. Most importantly, as a father of five children who share my passion for the sea, I want nothing more than for them to be able to spend their lives enjoying it in a clean, safe, and health risk-free environment.

I was with this in mind that I worked closely with my colleague from New Jersey in the 105th Congress to develop a "precursor" of this legislation, then H.R. 2094, as a means to work toward establishing reasonable national criteria for coastal water quality. While certain parts of the United States (led by my hometown of San Diego) have already developed and implemented comprehensive and progressive coastal testing and monitoring programs at both the state and local level, there are needs which up to this point have not been met, and problems which have not been fully addressed. This lack of consistency in the levels of protection provided by such monitoring and notification nationwide puts at risk beachgoers from coast to coast.

Roughly 60 percent of all Americans live within 30 miles of a coast, and far too often, surfers, swimmers, and others who enjoy using the water serve as inadvertent "canaries in the coal mine". These are the people, particularly children, who are susceptible to and develop the ear, nose, and throat infections, fevers, and respiratory or stomach ailments that can and do occur as a result contact with pathogen-contaminated water. There is a clear need, both for people who live on the coastlines in places like San Diego and Rehobeth Beach and surf or swim every day, and for people who live inland and bring their families to the shore once or twice a year, to be able to understand and be provided with information as to whether the water is safe for them to enjoy before they enter it. This is where consistency in the levels of protection provided by monitoring and notification at coastal areas is necessary.

This is the basic focus of H.R. 999—to be a first step towards identifying where problems exist and where there is a need for monitoring, recognizing the science and capacity we have to respond to them, and providing the tools, incentives, and flexibility to states and communities that they need to create programs and

implement them appropriately. Most importantly, the bill provides the ability to develop and administer these programs in a "bottoms up" fashion, while moving away from outdated "command and control" strategies which may have served us well in the past, but are too cumbersome and unwieldy to provide useful solutions to today's challenges.

The en bloc amendment which will be offered shortly will be carefully explained, but I'd like to speak to one of the seemingly minor aspects of the amendment. In the short title of the bill, "assessment" is changed to "awareness". While this may seem insignificant, I wanted to make this change at this time to help underscore the entire point of the bill. Increased awareness is what this bill seeks to achieve, starting at the community level, and is what will lead to better protection of the public health and the environment at our coastal recreational water, both within and without the scope of H.R. 999.

The whole concept of this bill is to encourage nationwide monitoring of coastal recreation waters where it is needed to protect the public health, and public notification of the results—but from the community on up, not the top down. By empowering local health officials and communities to work directly with state and federal officials, H.R. 999 provides the opportunity and incentive to develop monitoring plans that will protect public safety on a regional or beach by beach basis.

It is important to recognize that H.R. 999 is not an expansion of regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act—it provides no new regulatory authority to any federal agency, and the bill language and accompanying congressional intent in the Committee report makes it clear that it may not be interpreted to do so. Its scope is limited to the monitoring of coastal recreation waters for pathogens or their indicators which are harmful to public health; it does not provide for source identification or regulation (specifically, at present non-point sources are not regulated under the Clean Water Act, and H.R. 999 does not change that).

H.R. 999 creates no unfunded mandates. States or local governments which may already have a robust monitoring program in place, as in Florida, California, or New Jersey—are not required to submit or develop a "new" program under this bill. The intent of the bill is not to lead to "dual monitoring" by the EPA in areas where appropriate monitoring is already taking place; it is to serve to encourage the development of monitoring programs in areas where none exist and where there is a need to protect the public health. Further, the updating and review of science-based criteria which will occur under the bill will be an asset to both new and existing monitoring programs, and lead to better levels of protection across the board.

The bill clarifies that state criteria for pathogens or pathogen indicators must be at least as protective of human health as previously published EPA criteria, which date back almost 14 years to 1986, and the incorporation of these new or revised criteria into state programs will also help to ensure that the scientific information on which the criteria themselves and individuals programs are based is kept current.

EPA is required under the bill to develop these criteria through a public process, which includes collaboration with appropriate local, state, and federal officials. This will include cri-

teria for determining what areas of coastal recreation waters do not need to be monitored to protect the public health. The bill does not require, nor does it expect, that monitoring and notification programs will be the same in all states for all recreation waters where it is needed. Here is where the flexibility of the bill is essential, to allow for specific needs to be addressed on a regional basis.

Again, the goal of H.R. 999 is to create uniform levels of protection, not uniform monitoring programs, as might have been the case under previous incarnations of this bill.

The information database which will be established under the bill is an important asset to maintaining and improving measures for protecting the public health at coastal recreation waters, and pains have been taken to ensure that the databases will be used effectively for that specific purpose. I should clarify at this point that such a database was considered an essential tool for public health purposes by both my County Department of Environmental Health and by the Surfrider Foundation, and I think the dialogue which we have had in developing H.R. 999 has reinforced this view.

The bill specifies that this database will consist only of information on exceedances of water quality standards for pathogens that are harmful to human health, not to sources of causes. To address concerns which were expressed over potential misuse of the databases, the bill language was strengthened to clarify that only information on water quality standard exceedances for pathogens or pathogen indicators, from reliable water quality monitoring programs, may be included in the database. Access to important scientific information is what is intended and will be derived from the development and use of this database.

In sum, this is very much an incentive-based process; the bill provided that availability of federal grant funding to state and/or local governments which have established or are encouraged to establish an adequate monitoring program. The list which H.R. 999 requires to be maintained of area which do and do not have monitoring programs in place will serve as an additional incentive to state and local governments to develop and implement a monitoring program which best meets their own specific regional needs. It will also demonstrate to both residents and tourists alike that there is a system in place to make sure coastal recreation waters in question are safe and protective of human health, and give them a means by which they can understand and be aware of water conditions in a given area, and make their own decisions as a result.

By providing financial and public incentives rather than the threat of punitive action, H.R. 999 creates a fair process by which to establish means to effectively monitor coastal waters, and to make the public aware of those results and conditions.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, thank you again for this opportunity and your support. Together we can make sure that the American people, whether they live on the coast or in the heartland, are never again accidental "canaries in a coal mine" at our nation's beaches. Let's pass H.R. 999 today, and see it signed into law this year.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following material:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST  
ESTIMATE*H.R. 999—Beaches Environmental Assessment,  
Cleanup, and Health Act of 1999*

Summary: H.R. 999 would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require states to adopt water quality criteria for coastal recreation waters consistent with those developed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the purpose of protecting human health in coastal recreation waters (beaches). The bill would authorize EPA to provide grants to states of \$30 mil-

lion annually over the 2000-2004 period to implement programs to monitor the quality of coastal waters and to notify the public of any conditions where beach water does not meet the established standards. In addition, the legislation would require EPA to issue new water quality criteria for recreational coastal areas based on studies of potential human health risks in these areas, make available to the public a database of the water quality at coastal recreational areas, and report to the Congress on the efforts under this program.

Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 999 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 999 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By fiscal years, in millions of dollars—					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Budget Authority <sup>1</sup> .....	3	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays .....	3	0	0	0	0	0
Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level .....	0	34	34	34	34	34
Estimated Outlays .....	0	19	28	34	34	34
Spending Under H.R. 999:						
Estimated Authorization Level <sup>1</sup> .....	3	34	34	34	34	34
Estimated Outlays .....	3	19	28	34	34	34

<sup>1</sup> The 1999 level is the amount appropriated for that year.

Basis of estimate: For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted before the start of fiscal year 2000 and that the full amounts authorized will be appropriated for each fiscal year. Estimated outlays are based on historical spending patterns of similar EPA programs.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$30 million a year for grants to states to implement programs to monitor and report on beach water quality. Based on information from EPA, CBO estimates that the agency would incur additional costs of about \$4 million annually over the 2000-2004 period to study health hazards in coastal recreational waters, establish new criteria for monitoring water quality for these waters, develop a national database on pollution of beaches, and report to the Congress on the effectiveness of this program.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: H.R. 999 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. While the bill would require states to establish acceptable water quality standards for coastal areas within three and a half years, if states choose not to establish these standards, the EPA would do it for them. The bill would authorize \$30 million annually from 2000 through 2004 for states and local governments to implement eligible monitoring and notification programs. If they choose not to implement these programs, the EPA would be directed to use remaining money authorized by this bill to provide those programs for them. Any costs incurred by state and local governments to implement these programs would be voluntary and conditions of receiving grant assistance.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs: Kim Cawley. Impact on State, local, and tribal governments: Lisa Cash Driskill.

Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Press Release: March 4, 1999.

From: American Oceans Campaign.

AMERICAN OCEANS CAMPAIGN HAILS CONGRESSMAN FOR HIS COMMITMENT TO THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW ABOUT BEACH WATER QUALITY

WASHINGTON, DC.—Representatives of American Oceans Campaign (AOC) voiced their strong endorsement of legislation introduced today by Representative Brian Bilbray (R-CA). The Beaches Environmental

Assessment, Cleanup and Health Act of 1999 (the B.E.A.C.H. Bill) addresses the problems of inconsistent beach water quality testing and public notification practices across the nation.

"From coast to coast, surfers, children, and others are becoming ill after swimming in beach waters contaminated with disease-causing microorganisms," said Ted Danson, President of American Oceans Campaign. "All recreational beach waters should be tested consistently and the public should be informed when waters are unsafe."

"Beach goers have a right to know that the waters they choose to play in are safe for recreation. A fun day at the beach should not make you sick the morning after," said Danson.

"Gastroenteritis and various eye, ear, nose, and throat infections can develop after contact with waters contaminated with bacteria and viruses," explained David Younkman, AOC's Executive Director. "The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recommended water quality criteria for beach waters; however, many states either use weaker standards or do not regularly test their waters for the presence of bacteria and viruses. Shockingly, many states that do test their waters do not always alert the public about unhealthy water conditions."

"The current approach to beach water testing is a mixture of inconsistent criteria and practices," said Younkman. "Passing the B.E.A.C.H. bill will wipe out the inconsistencies and improve public health protections nationwide."

"The B.E.A.C.H. bill will make certain that whether a person chooses to surf in San Clemente or snorkel in the Florida Keys, she enters the ocean with greater confidence about the quality of the water," said Danson. "Representative Bilbray and other members of Congress who have introduced similar measures are to be congratulated for their leadership on this environmental and public health concern. American Oceans Campaign looks forward to energetically working with them to pass a strong B.E.A.C.H. Bill in 1999."

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, Mar. 5, 1999]

## END POLLUTED BEACHES

BILBRAY BILL WOULD REQUIRE NATIONAL  
TESTING

San Diego County instituted an aggressive testing program for its coastal waters year ago. Now it has begun DNA screening of pol-

luted runoff to find out exactly why our beaches are sometimes polluted.

And what have we gotten for this effort? Nationwide scrutiny and criticism for having dirty beaches.

But the fact is, our beaches aren't dirtier than other places. (They're actually cleaner than many others.) We've been singled out only because we test more vigorously and close beaches when bacteria levels are too high. Most coastal areas in other states don't maintain effective testing programs. And some places never tell the public when they do find high pathogen levels.

Rep. Brian Bilbray, R-Imperial Beach, introduced legislation yesterday that would put all coastal regions on an equal plane. Endorsed by several environmental groups, including the Surfrider Foundation, Bilbray's Beaches Environmental Assessment, Cleanup and Health Act (with the clever acronym BEACH), would establish uniform national criteria for testing and monitoring recreational coastal waters. It also would require public notification when those waters endanger public health.

This is a very good idea. Now, the standards for beach water cleanliness are very loose. Some coastal states use very weak standards. Others have a policy of silence even when they do test, probably because of concerns about scaring away tourists.

Bacteria and viruses in coastal waters can sicken bathers, causing gastroenteritis and ear, eye, nose and throat infections. People in states that don't test properly could be getting sick from polluted water and never know the cause.

The BEACH bill would develop standards with the help of local health officials. Also, since some coastal areas have different problems or conditions, individual monitoring programs tailored to certain regions would be allowed. Federal grants would be available for local monitoring programs.

Bilbray's legislation doesn't include a strong enforcement mechanism for beach areas that don't comply. However, the federal Environmental Protection Agency would keep a list of such areas and make it available to the public. Compliance must be addressed at some point after water quality standards and monitoring programs are developed.

While Congress considers monitoring beach pollution nationwide, San Diego County is taking an advanced step in cleaning up its coastal waters. After local environmental advocate Donna Frye pushed the idea for a year, the county is set to begin DNA testing



to find the origins of bacterial pollution at our beaches. This scientific monitoring should tell us exactly where the pollution originates, so we can take steps to stop it at its source.

Monitoring beach pollution isn't expensive. But most coastal regions neglect it because they're afraid of what they might find. It's time to stop ignoring coastal pollution, and start doing something about it, as San Diego County does. Congress should approve Bilbray's BEACH bill.

[From Inside EPA, Mar. 19, 1999]

LEGISLATION WOULD REQUIRE NEW EPA  
STANDARDS FOR BEACH QUALITY  
(By Jean Wiedenheft)

Legislation requiring EPA to establish water quality monitoring standards for recreational beaches may pass this year as environmentalists and states appear to be on the verge of an acceptable compromise, observers agree.

In previous sessions, bills have been introduced into both houses of Congress that would require certain baseline monitoring of water quality, followed by notification of the public if the water does not meet set standards. But the language has always been shot down by states concerned over its implementation.

Under the new legislation introduced by Rep. Brian Bilbray (R-CA), EPA would set monitoring standards for beaches, though states would not be forced to implement those standards. Instead, EPA would publicize states that failed to meet the federal standards. If states still do not implement a monitoring program, under the legislation EPA would monitor the beaches in the state. EPA already has guidelines in place for states, suggesting contaminants to monitor for and contaminant levels at which the public should be notified of possible danger.

States are saying the new version of the bill—H.R. 999—is much closer to being acceptable to them, with one source adding that the bill's sponsors are "serious" about working with them to see the bill pass. Environmentalists are endorsing the measure.

As the bill is written, states would be required to monitor beaches for certain pollutants and pathogens, and make that information available to the public through the Internet and local newspapers if there is a threat.

Such legislation is necessary, environmentalists and bill supporters say, because only some states monitor their beaches, and even fewer post warnings or close beaches when water contaminants reach unsafe levels.

It is difficult to get a handle on how many coastal areas are actually being monitored, sources say, because often it is through a local initiative, not a state program.

The bill provides \$7.5 million a year, from 2000 to 2004, in grants for states to implement the programs. But a state source says that while the funding is an increase over last year's proposal, it is still too low. There are over 30 states that have coastal areas and would need funding to implement and maintain a monitoring program, this source points out, and any one state can only apply for half of its costs.

Some state sources also say the structure of the proposed law would need to be modified to allow them more flexibility. Any legislation should focus on meeting performance objectives, one source points out, not on procedural monitoring requirements.

The timeliness proposed in the legislation, for example, may need to have more flexibility for gathering and reporting data. In some cases, one source points out, it takes several days to get laboratory analyses back

before knowing whether the public should be warned about swimming at a particular beach.

The legislation can also only reasonably apply to public beaches, one source points out, because the states do not have the resources—or the authority—to impose such regulations on private citizens.

But several state sources say Bilbray's staff have been open to their suggestions, and are willing to negotiate in order to get the legislation through.

A similar House bill has been introduced by Rep. Frank Pallone (D-NJ), and Sens. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), Frank Torricelli (D-NJ), Barbara Boxer (D-CA), and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) are cosponsoring the beach bill in the Senate.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 999. I want to thank my fellow Californian (Mr. BILBRAY) for his leadership on this issue.

Today is Earth Day, and I want to wish all Members a happy Earth Day, and I want to encourage them to do something about this being Earth Day by supporting this legislation.

Most of us do not think about how the oceans and coasts are important to our lives, but they really are. A beautiful coastline is important to each of us in each of our districts. We are a Nation that travels and visits relatives, we visit beautiful places. An awful lot of those places are coastlines, because 70 percent of America's population lives within 50 miles of the coast.

Americans love the oceans. According to the 1997 SeaWeb and Melman poll and a 1999 USA Today poll, more than half of Americans have observed that the conditions of our coasts are worsening, especially due to pollution and overfishing, and they want us, Members of Congress, to do something about it.

We are critically dependent upon the ocean for ocean resources for tourism purposes, for travel dollars. Eighty-five percent of the tourist revenues spent in the United States are spent in the coastal States. Over 180 million people visit our coastal waters nationwide each year. In California alone the ocean-related tourism revenue exceeds \$38 billion.

Yet, our oceans are imperiled. Most of the major fish stocks in the world are overfished. Seventy-five percent of the endangered and threatened mammals and birds rely on coastal habitat. This will only get worse. Americans are moving to the coasts and exploiting them more than ever. By the year 2010, 75 percent of the U.S. population will live within 50 miles of the coast.

What are we going to do about this? What are we going to do to care for our coasts, to ensure that our coasts can support this intensity of habitation? We have not demonstrated our commitment yet to the oceans. We have not passed the Oceans Act, but we have this, and we can do something about it.

We have created national marine sanctuaries, which are essentially national parks in the ocean. We have 12 of those, yet with less than 1 percent of the funding that we give to our national parks. We have 378 national parks, 155 national forests, but only 12 national marine sanctuaries.

We need to make our coasts safe for everyone, including swimmers, surfers, fishers, and even the sea life, the fish themselves, the plants and the smallest of plankton organisms that they rely on. This bill is a step in that direction.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 999, and I wish my colleagues a happy Earth Day.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and all those who have put a lot of hard work and effort into this piece of legislation.

I especially want to tip my hat to the gentleman from California (Mr. BRIAN BILBRAY). Before BRIAN got here, I was the best surfer in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, BRIAN was elected, and seeing that there is another surfer, he is the best surfer in the House, even though sometimes he is a wave hog.

Let me say this, that this bill is a terrific piece of legislation. The gentleman has put a lot of effort into it. There are some conservatives with a few apprehensions, and the fact is that we do believe that the States should play a major role.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SHERRY BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BRIAN BILBRAY) have made sure that this bill represents a cooperation with the States, and not a domination of the States by the Federal Government.

The oceans, both as a recreational resource and an economic resource, are perhaps the most valuable asset we have in the United States of America. We have scuba diving, we have people like the gentleman from California (Mr. BRIAN BILBRAY) and myself who do a lot of surfing in the ocean, and we also have fishing and other recreational uses that add a tremendous value and are a tremendous asset to our people.

I am very pleased that this bill is the very first time where surfing is actually identified as a federally-recognized recreational activity. Whether when you are a surfer or a scuba diver, which I am also a scuba diver, but when one is in the ocean, one is experiencing one of God's most awesome gifts to humankind. It is a living force, and it is also in itself an entity of tremendous power and energy.

Those of us who surf and use the ocean know this, and it is like skiing on a mountain, except the mountain is going right with you. It is this tremendous, awesome power that you are with. The ocean represents this to all of humankind, this potential.



Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to realize that this bill, H.R. 999, is officially recognizing the ocean and recognizing this asset as a valuable asset in which we all in the States and in local communities and in the Federal Government will cooperate with in order to maintain this asset, and make sure it is available to those of us who use it. So many millions of Americans use this asset.

Let us also remember when we talk about the ocean, our bodies are made out of water. God made human bodies out of water, just like he made the world mainly out of water, so we are caretakers for God's gift.

Finally, my colleagues who have any thought of opposing this bill should know and be advised that if the amendment fails, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I will double the number of surfing videos that are played in the Congressional Gym.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), another sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Beaches Environmental Awareness Cleanup and Health Act, the BEACH bill. I am fortunate to represent and call home one of the most beautiful districts in our Nation, the central coast of California. People come from all around the world to visit the area, and they are especially attracted to our spectacular coastline and incredible beaches, where fishing, all kinds of tourism, and indeed, surfing go on on a regular basis. We had surfboards outside my family home all through the growing up years of my children.

Sadly, an increasingly familiar blight on these majestic beaches is a bright yellow sign reading "Advisory" or "Closure." Santa Barbara County issues beach advisories to warn the public of harmful elevated bacterial levels in the surf. Unfortunately, during the past years, and in 1997, a record 199 days saw this bright yellow beach sign in front of beaches on the Santa Barbara coastline.

The public should be able to enjoy their beaches without worrying about their health. We cannot tolerate people getting sick from swimming in the ocean.

Santa Barbara is blessed with a vibrant local citizen group which was formed as a public outcry to these polluted beaches. It is called Heal the Ocean. It is a grass roots group. I am proud to be a supporter. Heal the Ocean conducts testing of our coastal waters, and is engaged in a significant public outreach campaign to educate the community on this important issue. This group enjoys tremendous and well-deserved local support.

The bill we are debating today will provide critical Federal support to groups around the country, such as Heal the Ocean in Santa Barbara.

We all share a common goal, to protect and improve the quality of our

coastal waters, and to ensure public safety. By establishing national recreational water quality standards and empowering local communities to develop monitoring plans, the BEACH bill represents a strong step forward. This legislation will not only protect the health of our beaches, but also the health of our economy.

My district, like so many other coastal communities around the Nation, depends on recreation and tourism for its economic vitality. The cost of beach water quality monitoring is minuscule compared to the revenue that is generated by coastal tourism.

I do appreciate the hard work of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) in establishing this bill.

I would like to recognize the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who has been a leader on this issue for many years and has introduced critical beach legislation in the 105th Congress as well as the 106th Congress.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this important bill to protect public health, our beaches, and our coastal communities.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, today we celebrate Earth Day. It is only fitting that we take up this piece of legislation today as it deals with one of the most significant components of our environment, the coastal and recreational waters.

Each year millions of tourists flock to our beaches, and in Los Angeles County alone our tourism industry is worth about \$13 billion in average revenue. The beaches in that county generate most of that, and three or four of those beaches are in my district: Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, household names in our area. They play a significant role in generating that revenue.

There are real economic consequences that stem from protecting our environment, particularly the water resources. Helping build the public's confidence in the quality of this water will ensure its protection in the future.

The BEACH bill will help build this confidence in beaches across the country by establishing a uniform national standard. The bill will also allow local communities to tailor the monitoring and notification that meet their unique regional needs, and it provides incentives, not mandates, to meet the national criteria, incentives that take the form of grants from the Federal Government to implement monitoring and notification programs. In other words, instead of dictating to each jurisdiction how to meet a national standard, the Federal Government will give them flexibility and help cover

part of the cost. This is unprecedented environmental regulation.

Finally, several people say, why should we do this if California already has good monitoring? My constituents, when they go other places in this country, and Members' constituents all over the country, deserve to have good quality water to play in when they go to surf or swim in our recreational waters. If we standardize that monitoring, we all know, whether we are from California or from Michigan, whether the water is safe to be in.

I urge Members' support of the BEACH bill. It is solid national environmental policy. It brings together flexibility and incentives instead of mandates. It has local control instead of force-fed Federal policy. It is a good example of environmental policy supplementing economic policy. I urge Members' aye vote.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

As a representative of a Florida coastal district, I rise today to applaud my colleague, the gentleman from California, (Mr. BILBRAY) of San Diego for bringing this legislation to the Floor today.

In addition to being some of the nicest in this country, the beaches in my district are already clean and safe, and I am proud of that fact. I am a supporter of the BEACH bill because rather than taking a command and control approach to protecting our Nation's beaches, it utilizes a far more powerful approach, the power of information.

The BEACH bill establishes mechanisms that will let the public know where and when beaches are safe.

□ 1215

If coastal communities choose to risk the quality of their water, they will risk losing valuable tourist dollars. Floridians know this firsthand. When we improved the health of the local environment, we also improved the health of the local economy. Tourists are smart. Armed with information, they will spend their money where they know the beaches are clean and safe.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), for the long hours he has spent on this bill and his personal dedication and commitment in bringing it to this point of achievement; and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), chairman of the subcommittee, who has a long and distinguished record in the protection of the environment, and for his concern that we fashion a bill that will be useful and meaningful and effective and

for bringing it to the floor on this Earth Day; and of course to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the full committee, who already spoke quite pointedly of his support for this legislation.

But I rise today, not only in support of this legislation, but to recall for our colleagues my very dear friend and classmate, the class of the 1974 election, 94th Congress, Congressman Bill Hughes, who made this issue his cause during the time that he served in the House.

It is the culmination of years of effort, but culmination of a very deep-seated, genuine, ardent, vocal effort by Congressman Bill Hughes during his service in the Congress.

Together we served on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I recall both in committee and in one-on-one conversations with Bill Hughes his deep, genuine concern about the deterioration of the quality of water in the ocean that bordered on his State of New Jersey, his accounts of hypodermic needles washing up on the beaches, bringing some of the debris with him to our committee meetings and to one-on-one member meetings, the numerous health warnings that disturbed us so greatly, the beach closings, and the health effects on users of the New Jersey coastline; and that brought him to other coastlines in other parts of the country, and he really made this a great concern.

I will recall his statement on introducing essentially this bill, his version, which was a predecessor to today's legislation, "This bill is a great improvement to the policies that currently exist in beach testing and monitoring. It provides a public health stamp of approval for States proudly to show people who live and vacation along the shore that the coastal waters are safe for swimming and other related activities."

Following Bill Hughes' retirement from Congress, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), a successor, not particularly from that district, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), directly from that district, championed the cause along with the later arrival in the House of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), who has been persistent and vigorous and single-minded in his purpose of getting this legislation through the committee and to the House floor. Great advocates. The torch really has been passed from Bill Hughes to a new generation of advocates for quality of life along our freshwater and saltwater beaches.

This bill attempts to assure American families that the only concern they will have when going to the beach is how much sunblock they have on, not what rashes or illnesses they may have developed after an outing to the beach.

When we consider, as our colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS) a moment ago cited, 199 days of beach closings in

areas of her district, there were 22,746 beach closings in the decade from 1988 to 1998, that is not acceptable. We have to do a better job of monitoring, of stewardship for these great resources of the Nation's freshwater and saltwater beaches.

The idea of a monitoring bill is good. This bill has two public health goals, to have uniform monitoring of coastal recreational waters and uniform means of notification to the public of unhealthy water conditions.

The partnerships between the Federal Government and the coastal States and the local communities that this bill brings about are good. They are good steps in the right direction, \$30 million for grants to States and communities to establish monitoring programs.

But I just want to make it clear that, and no one should misunderstand the purpose of this bill, this is for monitoring and for notification. It does not go to cleanup. It does not address the upland issues of nonpoint source runoff, of discharges by cities and other entities into those rivers and estuaries that discharge on and lay their debris upon the beaches.

It will be argued that there are other programs, other means, other ways of doing this. But because I have heard from people who say, oh, we are going to do something about cleaning up the beaches, no, we are going to do something about notifying people about unsafe conditions. We are going to do something about monitoring those conditions with this legislation.

I also note repeated references to giving the States their responsible authority to undertake this role, and that is true. This is a Federal-State partnership. But I do want to remind my colleagues that the thin line of sand or pebbles that are the beach is the dividing point between the ocean and the land.

It is the ocean that is the common heritage of all mankind. It does not belong to a State or a Nation. As a Nation, we have a greater responsibility than any individual State does for the quality of that ocean and the littoral, the linkage between the land and the water.

This is a good step in the right direction. It will be a step, I hope, that heightens our awareness of the individual responsibility each of us has, that the responsibility to each State has and that this Nation has toward that greater body of water, the ocean, the common heritage of all mankind and, in the case of the Great Lakes, one-fifth of all the freshwater on the face of the Earth.

So I urge our colleagues to support this legislation and that we move it along to signature by the President as quickly as possible.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by once again thanking the gentleman from

California (Mr. BILBRAY), all those who worked so hard to make this day a reality. Let me compliment the House of Representatives on this Earth Day 1999. On a bipartisan basis, we have Democrats and Republicans working constructively to develop responsible public policy that will protect the families health and well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for a closing word.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank both the ranking members and the chairmen for their work on this bill.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, this bill has had a lot of people who have worked on it for a long time who are not here today. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) worked hard with me at trying to figure out how to get to this point to where we can get the Federal Government working with the States, and now with H.R. 999 we will be able to do something that, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) pointed out, is getting the information to the local community so that they are empowered to know there is a problem, which is the first and most critical step of knowing how to respond to it.

I would say in closing, personally, back in 1970 on the first Earth Day, I was a high school senior and I wore the green and blue armbands, and I was protesting the pollution of my beaches in south San Diego. Sad to say, almost 30 years later, our beaches are still polluted by the Republic of Mexico, and that is something that we need to and are working to address.

But this bill does something that we said back in 1970, and it was a big battle cry that we had in the environmental movement, "Think globally but act locally." This bill empowers the local community to have the local information so that they can address their problems in their neighborhood, in their community, and have the Federal Government as an ally in the local effort to act locally, to be able to take care of the global problem.

I thank this body, and I thank the chairmen and the ranking members for the chance to be able to bring this bill up for action.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule each section is considered read.

Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 106-103 if offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) or his designee. That amendment

shall be considered read, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

After disposition of that amendment, the bill, as perfected, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment.

During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

An amendment made in order by House Resolution 145 offered by Mr. BOEHLERT:

Page 2, line 5, strike "Assessment" and insert "Awareness".

Page 3, line 8, strike "If a State" and all that follows through "paragraph (1)(A)." on line 10 and insert the following:

If a State has not adopted water quality criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(A) that are as protective of human health as the criteria for pathogens and pathogen indicators for coastal recreation waters that the Administrator has published under section 304(a)(9),

Page 6, line 13, after "State," insert "tribal,".

Page 7, line 9, strike "shall" and insert "is authorized to".

Page 7, line 10, after "States," insert "Indian tribes,".

Page 7, line 14, after "State," insert "and tribal,".

Page 7, line 16, strike "shall" and insert "is authorized to".

Page 7, line 16, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 7, line 23, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 7, line 25, strike "shall" and insert "is authorized to".

Page 8, line 1, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 8, line 9, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 8, line 14, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 8, line 19, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 10, line 17, after "State" insert "or tribal".

Page 11, line 8, strike "shall" and insert "is authorized to".

Page 11, line 17, strike "shall" and insert "is authorized to".

Page 12, line 15, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 12, line 17, after "State" insert "or Indian tribe".

Page 13, after line 20, insert the following:

"(c) FEDERAL AGENCY PROGRAMS.—Each Federal agency shall develop, through a process that provides for public notice and an opportunity for comment, a program for monitoring and notification to protect public health and safety that meets the performance criteria established under subsection (a) for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal agency. Each Federal agency program shall address the matters identified in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iii).

Page 13, line 21, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Page 14, line 5, strike "The Administrator" and all that follows through line 10 and insert the following: "The Administrator may include in the database other information only if the information is on exceedances of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators for coastal recreation waters and is made available to the Administrator from other coastal water quality monitoring programs determined to be reliable by the Administrator. The data base may provide such information through electronic links to other databases determined to be reliable by the Administrator."

Page 14, line 11, strike "(d)" and insert "(e)".

Page 14, line 12, after "States" insert ", Indian tribes,".

Page 14, line 16, strike "(e)" and insert "(f)".

Page 15, strike lines 8 through 19 and insert the following:

"(g) EPA IMPLEMENTATION.—With respect to a State that has no program for monitoring for and notification of exceedances of the applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators in coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) open to the public that protects public health and safety, after the last day of the 3-year period beginning on the date the Administrator identifies, on a list required pursuant to subsection (f), discrete areas of coastal recreation waters in the State that are not subject to a monitoring and notification program meeting the performance criteria established under subsection (a), the Administrator shall conduct, subject to the conditions of subsection (b)(2), a monitoring and notification program for such discrete areas using the funds appropriated for grants under subsection (b), including salaries, expenses, and travel.

Page 15, line 20, strike "(g)" and insert "(h)".

Page 15, line 21, after "States" insert ", Indian tribes,".

Page 16, line 7, insert "coastal" before "estuaries".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), as the designee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This will be very quick. The en bloc amendment deals with noncontroversial bipartisan amendments, technical and clarifying. They have been worked out by the ranking minority member. I would like to give special credit to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), who helped with the agriculture community to get us to this point. I urge their adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the bill, I support the en bloc amendment. I would like to also take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) for his cooperative effort and willingness to work with me in addressing the concerns that the agricultural community had initially expressed, and which are addressed by the en bloc.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Beaches Environmental Assessment, Cleanup, and Health Act of 1999".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

#### SEC. 2. ADOPTION OF COASTAL RECREATION WATER QUALITY CRITERIA AND STANDARDS BY STATES.

*Section 303 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"(i) COASTAL RECREATION WATER QUALITY CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.—*

*"(I) ADOPTION BY STATES.—*

*"(A) INITIAL CRITERIA AND STANDARDS.—Not later than 3½ years after the date of enactment of this subsection, each State having coastal recreation waters shall adopt and submit to the Administrator water quality criteria and standards for such waters for those pathogens and pathogen indicators for which the Administrator has published criteria under section 304(a).*

*"(B) NEW OR REVISED STANDARDS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of publication by the Administrator of new or revised water quality criteria under section 304(a)(9), each State having coastal recreation waters shall adopt and submit to the Administrator new or revised water quality standards for such waters for all pathogens and pathogen indicators for which the Administrator publishes new or revised water quality criteria.*

*"(2) FAILURE OF STATES TO ADOPT.—If a State has not complied with paragraph (1)(A) by the date specified in paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall promptly prepare and publish proposed regulations for the State setting forth revised or new water quality standards for coastal recreation waters for the pathogens and pathogen indicators subject to paragraph (1)(A). If the Administrator prepares and publishes such regulations under subsection (c)(4)(B) before the date specified in paragraph (1)(A), the Administrator shall promulgate any revised or new standard under this paragraph not later than the date specified in paragraph (1)(A).*

*"(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Except as expressly provided by this subsection, the requirements and procedures of subsection (c) apply to this subsection."*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

**SEC. 3. REVISIONS TO WATER QUALITY CRITERIA.**

(a) **STUDIES.**—Section 104 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1254) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) **STUDIES CONCERNING PATHOGEN INDICATORS IN COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and after consultation and collaboration with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials (including local health officials) and other interested persons, the Administrator shall conduct, in cooperation with the heads of other Federal agencies, studies to provide additional information for use in developing—

“(1) a more complete determination of potential human health risks resulting from exposure to pathogens in coastal recreation waters, including effects to the upper respiratory system;

“(2) appropriate and effective indicators for improving detection in a timely manner in coastal recreation waters of the presence of pathogens that are harmful to human health;

“(3) appropriate, accurate, expeditious, and cost-effective methods (including predictive models) for detecting in a timely manner in coastal recreation waters the presence of pathogens that are harmful to human health; and

“(4) guidance for State application of the criteria for pathogens and pathogen indicators to be issued under section 304(a)(9) to account for the diversity of geographic and aquatic conditions.”

(b) **REVISED CRITERIA.**—Section 304(a) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) **REVISED CRITERIA FOR COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and after consultation and collaboration with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials (including local health officials), the Administrator shall issue new or revised water quality criteria for pathogens and pathogen indicators (including a revised list of testing methods, as appropriate) based on the results of the studies conducted under section 104(v) for the purpose of protecting human health in coastal recreation waters.

“(B) **REVIEWS.**—At least once every 5 years after the date of issuance of water quality criteria under this paragraph, the Administrator shall review and, as necessary, revise the water quality criteria.”

**SEC. 4. COASTAL RECREATION WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.**

Title IV of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341–1345) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 406. COASTAL RECREATION WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.**

“(a) **MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, after consultation and collaboration with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials (including local health officials), and after providing public notice and an opportunity for comment, the Administrator shall publish performance criteria for—

“(1) monitoring (including specifying available methods for monitoring) coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of

access) that are open to the public for attainment of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators and for protection of public safety from floatable materials; and

“(2) promptly notifying the public, local governments, and the Administrator of any exceedance of applicable water quality standards for coastal recreation waters described in paragraph (1) (or the immediate likelihood of such an exceedance).

The performance criteria shall provide for the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) to be carried out as necessary for the protection of public health and safety.

“(b) **PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall make grants to States and local governments for the purpose of developing and implementing programs for monitoring and notification, as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(2) **STATE PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall make grants to a State for developing and implementing a program for monitoring and notification to protect public health and safety that meets the performance criteria established under subsection (a) for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and are subject to the jurisdiction of the State.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Administrator shall make grants for implementation of a program of a State under subparagraph (A) only if the Administrator determines that—

“(i) the program has been developed through a process that provides for public notice and an opportunity for comment;

“(ii) the program meets the performance criteria under subsection (a), based on a review of the program, including information provided by the State under clause (iii); and

“(iii) the program—

“(I) identifies coastal recreation waters within the jurisdiction of the State;

“(II) identifies those coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and subject to the jurisdiction of the State and that are covered by the program;

“(III) identifies those coastal recreation waters covered by the program that would be given a priority for monitoring and notification if fiscal constraints prevent compliance at all coastal recreation waters covered by the program with the performance criteria established under subsection (a);

“(IV) identifies the process for making any delegation of responsibility for implementing the program to local governments, the local governments, if any, to which the State has delegated or intends to delegate such responsibility, and the coastal recreation waters covered by the program that are or would be the subject of such delegation;

“(V) specifies the frequency of monitoring based on the periods of recreational use of such waters and the nature and extent of use during such periods;

“(VI) specifies the frequency and location of monitoring based on the proximity of such waters to known point and nonpoint sources of pollution and in relation to storm events;

“(VII) specifies which methods will be used for detecting levels of pathogens and pathogen indicators that are harmful to human health and for identifying short-term increases in pathogens and pathogen indicators that are harmful to human health in coastal recreation waters, including in relation to storm events;

“(VIII) specifies measures for prompt communication of the occurrence, nature, location, pollutants involved, and extent of such an exceedance (or the immediate likelihood of such an exceedance) to the Administrator and a designated official of a local government having ju-

risisdiction over land adjoining the coastal recreation waters covered by the State program for which an exceedance is identified; and

“(IX) specifies measures for posting of signs at the beach (or other point of access), or functionally equivalent communication measures, sufficient to give notice to the public of an exceedance (or the immediate likelihood of an exceedance) of applicable water quality criteria for pathogens and pathogen indicators for such waters and the potential risks associated with water contact activities in such waters.

“(3) **LOCAL PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall make a grant to a local government for developing and implementing a program for monitoring and notification to protect public health and safety that meets the performance criteria established under subsection (a) for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and subject to the jurisdiction of the local government.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Administrator shall make grants for implementation of a local government program under subparagraph (A) only if the Administrator determines that—

“(i) the State in which the local government is located did not submit a grant application meeting the requirements of paragraph (2)(B) within one year following the date of publication of performance criteria under subsection (a);

“(ii) the local government program has been developed through a process that provides for public notice and an opportunity for comment;

“(iii) the local government program meets the performance criteria under subsection (a), based on a review of the local government program, including information provided by the local government under paragraph (2)(B)(iii); and

“(iv) the local government program addresses the matters identified in paragraph (2)(B)(iii) with respect to such waters.

“(4) **LIST OF WATERS.**—Following receipt of a grant under this subsection, a State or local government shall apply the prioritization established by the State or local government under paragraph (2)(B)(iii)(III) and promptly submit to the Administrator—

“(A) a list of discrete areas of coastal recreation waters that are subject to the program for monitoring and notification for which the grant is provided where the performance criteria under subsection (a) will be met; and

“(B) a list of discrete areas of coastal recreation waters that are subject to the program for monitoring and notification for which the grant is provided where fiscal constraints will prevent compliance with the performance criteria under subsection (a).

“(5) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The Federal share of the cost of developing and implementing a monitoring and notification program under this subsection shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent, as determined by the Administrator. The non-Federal share of such cost may be met through in-kind contributions.

“(6) **DELEGATION.**—If a State delegates responsibility for monitoring and notification under this subsection to a local government, the State shall make a portion of any grant received by the State under paragraph (2) available to the local government in an amount commensurate with the responsibilities delegated.

“(c) **INFORMATION DATABASE.**—The Administrator shall establish, maintain, and make available to the public by electronic and other means a national coastal recreation water pollution occurrence database that provides information on exceedances of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators for coastal recreation waters using information reported to the Administrator pursuant to a monitoring and notification program that meets the performance criteria established under subsection (a). The Administrator may include in the database information made available to the Administrator from other coastal water quality

monitoring programs determined to be reliable by the Administrator. The database may provide information through electronic links to other databases determined to be reliable by the Administrator.

"(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator shall provide technical assistance to States and local governments for the development of assessment and monitoring procedures for floatable materials to protect public health and safety in coastal recreation waters.

"(e) LIST OF WATERS.—Beginning not later than 18 months after the date of publication of performance criteria under subsection (a), the Administrator shall maintain a list of discrete areas of coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and are not subject to a program for monitoring and notification meeting the performance criteria established under subsection (a) based on information made available to the Administrator. The list also shall identify discrete areas of coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and are subject to a monitoring and notification program meeting the performance criteria established under subsection (a). The Administrator shall make the list available to the public through publication in the Federal Register and through electronic media. The Administrator shall update the list at least annually.

"(f) EPA IMPLEMENTATION.—After the last day of the 3-year period beginning on the date the Administrator identifies a discrete area of coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches (or other points of access) that are open to the public and are not subject to a monitoring and notification program meeting the performance criteria established under subsection (a), the Administrator shall conduct such a monitoring and notification program for the discrete area using the funds appropriated for grants under subsection (b), including salaries, expenses, and travel. The Administrator's duties under this paragraph shall be limited to the activities that can be performed using such funds.

"(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for making grants to States and local governments under subsection (b), including implementation of monitoring and notification programs by the Administrator under subsection (f), \$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004."

#### SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 502 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(21) COASTAL RECREATION WATERS.—The term 'coastal recreation waters' means the Great Lakes and marine coastal waters, including estuaries, used by the public for swimming, bathing, surfing, or other similar water contact activities.

"(22) FLOATABLE MATERIALS.—The term 'floatable materials' means any foreign matter that may float or remain suspended in the water column and includes plastic, aluminum cans, wood products, bottles, and paper products.

"(23) PATHOGEN INDICATORS.—The term 'pathogen indicators' means substances that indicate the potential for human infectious disease."

#### SEC. 6. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and within the succeeding 4-year period and periodically thereafter, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall transmit to Congress a report including—

(1) recommendations concerning the need for additional water quality criteria for pathogens and other actions needed to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters;

(2) an evaluation of Federal, State, and local efforts to implement this Act, including the amendments made by this Act; and

(3) recommendations on improvements to methodologies and techniques for monitoring of coastal recreation waters.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Administrator may coordinate the report under this section with other reporting requirements under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

#### SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this Act (including amendments made by this Act) for which amounts are not otherwise specifically authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 145, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill just passed, H.R. 999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1999

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objec-

tion to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1999

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, April 26, 1999, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 27, 1999, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) would be so kind as to provide us with an explanation of next week's schedule.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for this week. There will be no votes tomorrow, Friday, April 23. However, I would like to remind Members that there is a ceremony in the Capitol tomorrow celebrating the 50th anniversary of NATO and all Members are invited.

Of course, we will be releasing our official schedule this afternoon, but I would like to take this opportunity to outline next week's agenda.

The House will meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 26, for pro forma, but no legislative business will be held and no votes will be held on that day.

On Tuesday, April 27, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to all Members' offices. Members should note that we expect votes after 2 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, April 28 and Thursday April 29, the House will take up H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act; H.R. 833, the Bankruptcy Reform

Act of 1999; and a motion to go to conference on H.R. 4, the Missile Defense Act.

Members should also be advised that there may be action next week on the War Powers Resolution introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would be so kind as to continue to respond, does the gentleman anticipate that next week the supplemental appropriation bill providing Kosovo funding will be on the floor?

Mr. BILBRAY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, right now it is in committee and we are hoping that it will be expedited as quickly as possible. We do not have any guarantees at this time, but the committee is assuring us that they will get it to the floor as soon as possible.

Mr. WISE. The gentleman also referred to the Campbell resolution regarding the War Powers Act. Does he anticipate those actually being on the floor next week?

Mr. BILBRAY. We are expecting that it is very possible.

Mr. WISE. Since that is often as good as it gets in a legislative body, I thank the gentleman and wish him a good weekend.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to clarify to Members that they should note that we expect to conclude legislative business on Thursday, April 29, and we will not have any votes on Friday, April 30.

We hope this advance notice on scheduling enables Members to adjust their schedules.

Mr. WISE. Actually, the gentleman has kind of sparked something with me. If I could ask, following up on the Campbell resolution, if it is very possible, do we know what day it might be very possible that it would be coming to the floor?

Mr. BILBRAY. We are looking forward to Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. WISE. I thank the gentleman.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEMINT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EARTH DAY AND THE GREAT LAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, this is Earth Day. This is the day when, in the simplest of terms, we are supposed to say smokestacks are bad and trees are good, that cars are bad and bicycles and buses are good. Those of us concerned about the environment, of course, realize that environmental issues have many more facets.

Consider the case of the Great Lakes. It was in October, Mr. Speaker, that many of my colleagues gave unanimous approval to my resolution which called on the President and the other body to act to prevent the sale or diversion of Great Lakes water to foreign countries, businesses, corporations and individuals.

□ 1245

The House, speaking with one voice, asked that procedures be established to guarantee that any sale or diversion of Great Lakes water be fully negotiated and approved by representatives of the Governments of the United States and Canada.

I want to remind our colleagues of this House action because, Mr. Speaker, there is another threat to the Great Lakes, one which is posed by the drilling of oil and gas in and under the waters of our Great Lakes.

Let me take a few moments on this Earth Day to discuss water diversion and drilling in the Great Lakes. First, let me pose these questions: Are we being alarmists? Are diversion and drilling real threats to one of the world's most valuable resources?

Consider, Mr. Speaker, these facts in terms of this potential impact on the Great Lakes. Seventy percent of the Earth's surface is covered with water, but 97.5 percent of that is sea water. Only 2.5 percent of the surface water is fresh water. And nearly 70 percent of the fresh water is frozen glacial water.

The Great Lakes contains 6 trillion gallons of fresh water, one-fifth of the Earth's fresh water supply. The Great Lakes are home to 40 million people. One-quarter of Canada's population lives in the Great Lakes basin.

The World Bank predicts that by the year 2025, more than 3 billion people in 52 countries will suffer water shortages for drinking or sanitation. More than 300 cities in China right now are experiencing water shortages, and more than 100 are deemed to be in a condition of acute water scarcity. Citizens of the United States and Canada use and consume more than 100 gallons of water per day per person. The global water demand is doubling every 21 years. Eighty percent of all fresh water is used for agricultural purposes.

I would like to thank the Buffalo News for many of these facts, Mr. Speaker. I present them as random facts because, like pieces of a puzzle, they must be analyzed and arranged to see their importance.

The World Bank has studied this puzzle, and I call the attention of my colleagues to a quote from a World Bank report, which the Buffalo News used as the jump lead in a March 1999 story. The World Bank report predicted, "Wars of the next century will be fought over water."

Are we really be willing alarmists? A company in Sault St. Marie, Ontario, just one company, was given a permit to take up to 2.6 million gallons per day of water for the next 5 years. I was joined by members of the Ontario parliament and the New Democratic Party in bringing public attention to this permit, which was then revoked by the Ontario government.

But all fresh water will increasingly be eyed as a potential commodity on the world market.

A Vancouver-based company, Global Water Corporation, has an agreement with the Alaskan community of Sitka to take water from a lake and ship it by tanker to China. The deal allows Global to take up to 5 billion gallons a year for 30 years.

Now, I have spoken of just two companies. We know the market is there. We can easily see the overhead is minimal, the market is expanding, and the potential number of speculators and potential shippers is unlimited.

Let me say that one more time, Mr. Speaker, that although I have mentioned China twice in my remarks, I am not attempting to invoke it as a threat to our own security. China is merely a customer who is in need of water now. The world, the entire world, will be eyeing our natural resources in the Great Lakes.

As of today, the sale and diversion of Great Lakes water and all fresh water from North America remains unresolved. Following the House vote on my resolution, the U.S. and Canada have asked the international Joint Commission to study the issue of water diversion along the entire border from Alaska to the St. Lawrence River. Their preliminary report on diversion should be ready in about 5 months. A final report on our joint water resources should be done early next year.

In the meantime, it is the policy of my home State of Michigan to press for



drilling of oil and gas under the Great Lakes. Canada allows gas drilling directly in the Great Lakes. Proponents of oil drilling in the Great Lakes say the risk is minimal, small, tiny.

I say tiny is too big. A gallon of oil spilled in Lake Superior would take 999 years to be cleared out by natural flow; Lake Michigan, 99 years; Lake Huron, 60 years.

So if my colleagues want to play Russian roulette, Mr. Speaker, how many barrels on their gun would they be comfortable with? 100,000? One million?

I wish my colleagues in the Nation a happy Earth Day, and I ask them to consider my legislation to protect this valuable resource.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE OF 1915-1923

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as my colleagues and I do every year at this time, in a proud but solemn tradition to remember and pay tribute to the victims of one of history's worst crimes against humanity, the Armenian Genocide of 1915 to 1923.

The issue of genocide has been forced onto our conscience and consciousness at the end of the 20th century by the tragic events in Kosovo. The ugly term "ethnic cleansing" has become a frequently heard expression. Indeed, one of the major rationales for the current NATO campaign has been to prevent the 20th century, which began with genocide, from ending with genocide.

Comparisons can serve a useful and instructive role, but it is important at the same time to remember the uniqueness of an event such as the Armenian Genocide, one of the most horrible events of the 20th century and in all human history. Yet many, perhaps most Americans, and most people

around the world are barely aware of this extremely significant historical event.

Even more troubling than ignorance or indifference is the phenomenon of denial. Yes, just as with the obscene efforts to deny the Nazi Holocaust, there are actually people who try to deny that the Armenian Genocide ever happened. And we must meet these denials, these so-called revisionist claims, head on with the truth. The Armenian Genocide did happen.

The Armenian Genocide was the systematic extermination of one-and-a-half million Armenian men, women, and children during the final years of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. This was the first genocide of the 20th century, but sadly not the last.

Saturday, April 24, will mark the 84th anniversary of the unleashing of the Armenian Genocide. And Armenian-Americans throughout the United States, and people of conscience everywhere are commemorating this event in various ways. The commemoration that I will participate in will be held on Sunday afternoon in Times Square in New York City. And there will be commemorations in my home State of New Jersey, around the country, and around the world.

The ANCA and the Armenian Assembly of America have both been in the forefront of calling for recognition of the genocide not just for the people of Armenian descent but for all of us as an act of education and witness about the evils of genocide and the danger of forgetting.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the United States still does not officially recognize the Armenian Genocide. Bowing to strong pressure from Turkey, the U.S. State Department has for more than 15 years shied away from referring to the events of 1915 through 1923 by the word "genocide." President Clinton and his recent predecessors have annually issued proclamations on the anniversary of the genocide but always stopped short of using the word "genocide," thus minimizing and not accurately conveying what really happened.

In an effort to address this lapse in our own Nation's record, a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress will be working to enact legislation affirming the U.S. record on the Armenian Genocide.

Expected to be introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADONOVICH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), our Democratic whip, the legislation calls on the President to collect all U.S. records on the genocide and to provide them to the House Committee on International Relations, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Armenian Genocide Museum in Yerevan.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. should go clearly on record and unambiguously recognize the Armenian Genocide and set aside April 24 as a day of remembrance.

It is also nothing short of a crime against memory and human decency in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the Republic of Turkey denies that the genocide ever took place and has even mounted an aggressive effort to try to present an alternative and false version of history, using its extensive financial and lobbying resources in this country. The Turkish Government has embarked on a strategy of endowing Turkish studies programs at various universities around the U.S., including a program at Princeton University in my home State of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly a decade, the solemn remembrance of the tragedy of the genocide has been alleviated somewhat about the remarkable progress made by the Republics of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Among the international dignitaries coming to Washington this weekend to take part in the NATO summit will be President Kocharian of the Republic of Armenia. President Kocharian will also address Members of Congress next Tuesday in this Capitol Building. He will take time out from the NATO activities on Saturday to lay a wreath at the tomb of President Woodrow Wilson, whose administration recognized that what was happening to the Armenian people under the Ottoman Empire during and after World War I represented a unique kind of evil, and President Wilson tried to at least somewhat alleviate the suffering.

It is interesting that President Kocharian will be here as NATO is involved in a campaign against atrocities being committed against a civilian population. Back in the time of the Armenian Genocide, when Armenians were being murdered and deported and all record of the Armenian presence was erased, there was no Western alliance of democracies committed to stopping aggression, brutality, and genocide. Do we wish that there had been then?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me just say I know that the Armenian Genocide is a painful subject to discuss. Yet we must never forget what happened and never cease speaking out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today is Earth Day. I chose to commemorate Earth Day by introducing the Academic Excellence and Environmental



Sciences Act. My bill seeks to encourage academic rigor in scientific education by beginning at the lower grades through the study of the environmental sciences and the use of hands-on recycling.

This, of course, is the year of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and I hope that my bill will be included in the act. I have two goals here. The first comes from what I understand to be the difficulty of imparting and explaining scientific ideas and concepts, some of them fairly abstract, to elementary schoolchildren.

As a result of this difficulty, in the elementary grades, children are often relegated to "play science." This "play science" not only does not prepare them for science; it turns them off of science.

Secondly, I believe that hands-on recycling will help children learn at an early age habits that conserve our resources at the same time that it will help concretize their interest in science and their understanding of science. By the time many youngsters are exposed to science in high schools, large numbers of them have lost interest or are simply unready for the rigors that are necessary to become proficient.

We are suffering from starting too late to interest children in science. We are suffering because of the reduced pool of scientists and scientific experts.

Increasingly, many of our seats in colleges and universities are filled by young people from abroad, coming here to study science because we have the best science in the world. Part of the impetus for my bill comes from my experience in recruiting my own D.C. youngsters to the military academies.

I am pressing my own school system, the D.C. public schools, to begin science and math at earlier years so that children retain their interest in science and get prepared for the rigors of the military academies.

Although the major emphasis of my bill is scientific education for young children, I also hope to encourage recycling approaches. I believe that recycling techniques involving children—saving papers and crushing cans and talking about where these materials come from and why they degrade, etc.—will help concretize the underlying scientific ideas.

I also think children are the best messengers for recycling and for the environment. They are the real environmentalists in this society. If we want scientists, we had better get them before they get turned off and we had better learn that we must not begin in junior high school; we should begin much earlier than that or else they are off to computer games or cable or other interests.

We must begin at the beginning. The beginning is at the lower grade level. We must start there if we mean to groom scientists. We cannot start

grooming when they already have other interests. We want it started young, as well, because these young people can help us conserve our own resources by learning about recycling early and teaching us how to do it and why it is so necessary.

□ 1300

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 1480, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is to notify Members of the House that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of April 26 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 1480, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, April 27, to the Committee on Rules room, which is H-312 right here in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill, as reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KASICH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Thursday, April 22, 1999, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BILBRAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSE, for 5 minutes each day, on April 27 and 28.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, on April 27.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 531. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Rosa Parks in recognition of her contributions to the Nation.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1999, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1688. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Standards: Market Risk (RIN: 3064-AC14) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1689. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Collateral Eligible to Secure Federal Home Loan Bank Advances [No. 99-20] (RIN: 3069-AA77) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1690. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Consumer Leasing [Regulation M; Docket No. R-1028] received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1691. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1029] received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1692. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Policy Development, Federal Reserve Board of Governors, transmitting the Board's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Standards: Market Risk [Regulations H and Y; Docket No. R-0996] received April 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1693. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (RIN: 1840-AC59) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1694. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department

of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 under the Native Hawaiian Curriculum Development, Teacher Training, and Recruitment Program—April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1695. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Wasilla, Anchorage and Sterling, Alaska) [MM Docket No. 97-227, RM-9159, RM-9229, RM-9230] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1696. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Condon, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 98-173, RM-9361] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1697. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Palestine and Frankston, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98-37, RM-9238] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1698. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Hawesville and Whitesville, Kentucky) [MM Docket No. 98-2, RM-9217] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1699. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administrations' final rule—Medical Devices; Retention in Class III and Effective Date of Requirement for Premarket Approval for Three Preamendment Class III Devices [Docket No. 98N-0405] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1700. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Elimination of Reporting Requirement and 30-Day Hold in Loading Spent Fuel After Preoperational Testing of Independent Spent Fuel Storage or Monitored Retrievable Storage Installations (RIN: 3150-AG02) received April 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1701. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Orlando, Florida, Appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AI04) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1702. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Orlando, Florida, Appropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AI13) received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Preparation of Rolls of Indians

(RIN: 1076-AD89) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1704. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Swordfish Fishery; Dealer Permitting and Import Documentation Requirements [Docket No. 970829218-9064-03; I.D. 080597E] (RIN: 0648-AK39) received April 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1705. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Adjustments From Cape Falcon, OR, to Point Pitas, CA [Docket No. 980429110-8110-01; I.D. 032499B] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1706. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Cape Fear River, Wilmington, North Carolina [CGD 05-98-106] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1707. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; City of Augusta, GA [CGD07-98-068] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1708. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 Series Airplanes and KC-10 (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-197-AD; Amendment 39-11131; AD 99-08-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1709. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Puritan-BENNETT Aero Systems Company C351-2000 Series Passenger Oxygen Masks and Portable Oxygen Masks [Docket No. 98-CE-29-AD; Amendment 39-11130; AD 99-08-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1710. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 1900, 1900C, and 1900D Airplanes [Docket No. 96-CE-60-AD; Amendment 39-11129; AD 97-15-13 R2] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1711. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Withdrawal of International Airport Designation of Akron Fulton Airport [T.D. 99-40] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. ROGAN):

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to give priority, in the allotment of immigrant visas to unmarried sons and daughters of citizens, to an alien who attains the age of 21 after the date on which a petition to classify the alien is filed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1521. A bill to preserve and protect archaeological sites and historical resources of the central Mississippi Valley through the establishment of the Mississippi Valley National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System on former Eaker Air Force Base in Blytheville, Arkansas; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 1522. A bill to safeguard communities, lives, and property from catastrophic wildfire by authorizing contracts to reduce hazardous fuels buildups on forested Federal lands in wildland/urban interface areas while also using such contracts to undertake forest management projects to protect noncommodity resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H.R. 1523. A bill to establish mandatory procedures to be followed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in advance of the permanent closure of any forest road so as to ensure local public participation in the decisionmaking process; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 1524. A bill to authorize the continued use on public lands of the expedited processes successfully used for windstorm-damaged national forests and grasslands in Texas; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KING, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 1525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide simplified criteria, in lieu of the common law rules, for

determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor and to limit retroactive employment tax reclassifications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida (for himself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1526. A bill to promote the international competitiveness of the United States commercial space industry, to ensure access to space for the Federal Government and the private sector, and to minimize the opportunities for the transfer to other nations of critical satellite technologies; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WU, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. BARCIA):

H.R. 1527. A bill to provide funding for the academic programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. CUBIN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1528. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. MASCARA):

H.R. 1529. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to modify the treatment of certain patient days for purposes of determining the amount of disproportionate share adjustment payments to hospitals under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 1530. A bill to make forestry insurance plans available to owners and operators of private forest land, to encourage the use of prescribed burning on private forest land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FROST:

H.R. 1531. A bill to ensure safety in public schools by increasing police presence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 1532. A bill to strengthen warning labels on smokeless tobacco products; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1533. A bill to compensate the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma for the taking of certain rights by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1534. A bill to amend title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include programs that encourage academic rigor in scientific education in elementary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. KIND, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WISE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 1535. A bill to extend the milk price support program through 2002 at the rate in effect for 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to encourage the broadest possible participation of producers in the Federal crop insurance program and to ensure the continued availability of affordable crop insurance for producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide for the development and use of brownfields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGAN (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PITTS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 1538. A bill to provide flexibility to certain local educational agencies that develop voluntary public and private parental choice programs under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 1539. A bill to repeal the stock loan limit in the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1540. A bill to reform the Exchange Stabilization Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for screening retinal eye examinations under the Medicare Program for individuals diagnosed with diabetes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 1543. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat fraud and abuse under the Medicare Program with respect to partial hospitalization services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1544. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a

demonstration project to provide Medicare beneficiaries greater information with respect to various courses of treatment for certain diseases or injuries to enable the beneficiaries to make more informed decisions when selecting a course of treatment for the disease or injury; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for improved data collection and evaluations of State Children's Health Insurance Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased retirement savings opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1547. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements with respect to the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1548. A bill to provide for a 3-judge division of the court to determine whether cases alleging breach of secret Government contracts should be tried in court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself, Mr.

TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H.R. 1549. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a National Clean Water Trust Fund and to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to use amounts in that Fund to carry out projects to restore and recover waters of the United States from damages resulting from violations of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FARR of California (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY):

H. Res. 146. A resolution providing for the mandatory implementation of the Office Waste Recycling Program in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Res. 147. A resolution supporting the goals and ideas and commending the organizers of "Children's Memorial Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 45: Mr. PITTS, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 135: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILL of Indiana, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 205: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 240: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 248: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 358: Mr. DeFAZIO.

H.R. 425: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 530: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 576: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 617: Mr. FROST and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 632: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 716: Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 721: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 725: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 775: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. GARRY MILLER of California.

H.R. 797: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 828: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 872: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 876: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 883: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 997: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1041: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1109: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1111: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1130: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1183: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1221: Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PALLONE, and Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 1261: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1265: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WU, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1278: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 1301: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1309: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1342: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1368: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1408: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1467: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 1491: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 2, April 20, 1999, by Mr. CAMPBELL on H. Res. 126, was signed by the following Member: Tom Campbell.